FOR THE MEN AT THE FRONT
n you have finished reading this copy of The New-Church Review place a one-cent stamp on this corner and hand the
zine to any postal employee. The Post Office will send it to some soldier or sailor in our forces at the front. No Wrapping
address. A. S. BURLESON, Postmaster-General.

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

VOL. XXIV, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1917

Swedenborg's Method in Psychology.
CHARLES BYSE 481

Swedenborg's Influence upon Goethe.
WALDO C. PEEBLES 507

The Story of the Patriarchs. II. (The Word as a Whole: Second Series, V, 2.)
LEWIS F. HITE 537

The Solidarity of Humanity; or, The *Maximus Homo* and Modern Democracy.
WALTER B. MURRAY 553

The Theory of Evolution. [A Review of works by W. B. Scott and P. Kropotkin]
FRANK W. VERY 568

(For Editorial Department see next page)

Pacific School of Religion

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials:

Reconstruction and Radicalism. Lewis F. Hite - - - - - 592
The Luther Quadricentenary. B. A. Whittemore - - - - 601

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies:

The Origin of Evil. Jacob E. Werren - - - - - - - - - 614

Current Literature:

J. H. Leuba's "Belief in God and Immortality." - - - - - 622
A. A. Hobson's "Positive Protestantism." - - - - - - - 626
"Rational Orthodoxy." By a member of the Presbytery of New York. - 629
G. A. Gordon's "Aspects of the Infinite Mystery." - - - - 633
G. A. Coe's "The Psychology of Religion." - - - - - - - 636
E. J. E. Schreck's "A Rational Belief in Heaven." - - - - 638
C. W. Barron's "The Mexican Problem" - - - - - - - - 639

The New-Church Review

The New-Church Review is the lineal descendant of the *New-Jerusalem Magazine*, which was established as a monthly periodical in 1827. In 1893 it was believed that a quarterly review of the progress of the church and the world, allowing for longer articles and a more comprehensive treatment of subjects, would be of greater service. The form was therefore changed and a characteristic title adopted. The field to be covered has been the same for this long period now approaching a century, but greatly changed and ever changing more swiftly. The light in which it is viewed is from the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, unfolding as they do the spiritual meaning of the Holy Scriptures and fulfilling the prophecy of the Lord's Second Coming to save mankind.

The Board of Editors, as now organized, consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, and of the Rev. Wm. F. Wunsch and Mr. B. A. Whittemore; with the Rev. Messrs. James Reed and H. Clinton Hay in an advisory capacity.

PUBLISHED BY
THE MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION
134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON
50 Cents a Copy Albert P. Carter, Treas. $2.00 a Year
(Postage to Canada 12 Cents, and to Europe 25 Cents. Extra Per Annum.)
Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter

THE

NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXIV] OCTOBER, 1917 [No. 4

SWEDENBORG'S METHOD IN PSYCHOLOGY.*

BY PROF. CHARLES BYSE

Translated from the French by Mary E. Upton

WHAT was the method followed by Swedenborg in his theological writings? We must consider this question before making his psychology the special object of our examination. This method should be worthy of a scholar who has explored, with the acute penetration of genius, the various kingdoms of nature; worthy of a philosopher who has written most remarkable books, and measured himself with the most illustrious thinkers; worthy of a Christian entirely submissive to God and His Word, but none the less independent with

* This article is the translation of the first part of the final section of a work in five volumes by Prof. Charles Byse, of Lausanne, Switzerland — published in 1913–14. It may be recalled that the work as a whole was very favorably reviewed by the Rev. Frank Sewall, D.D., in the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW of October, 1914. Dr. Sewall than expressed the hope that it might be translated and published in this country. We understand that the work entitled "*Lettre ou Symbole*," by the same author, has been since translated by one of Dr. Sewall's daughters, and is now in the press. In the meantime it was thought that the present extract would not only be interesting to our readers, but would also serve to call attention to the work itself, which we trust will some time be published in full. — EDITORS.

regard to the dogmas formulated by councils and doctors of theology.

Returning to the philosopher, let us recall only that he had already written, in the beginning of his career, three volumes of *Opera Philosophica et Mineralia*, a Comparison of the Ontology and Cosmogony of Wolff with the *Principia*, an "Introduction to Rational Psychology," and a volume upon the three great questions of the day: "The Infinite," "The Final Cause of Nature," and "The Mysterious Connection between the Soul and the Body." After noting the importance of this last publication, the historian Mather concludes with these words:

> The great service rendered by Swedenborg in the discussion of those three questions is that of aiding in the name of truth, in freeing philosophy. In philosophy as in politics, in order that life and natural movement may return it is necessary to overthrow the despotism which impedes the circulation. Swedenborg was rightly impatient with the state of stagnation in which these authorities, Bacon, Descartes and Leibnitz, grown despotic, held the mind enslaved, and Wolff was right in paying tribute to him who had done so much for the freedom of thought. It is true that Swedenborg decided neither of these three questions, and every philosopher knows why, but he freely discussed them all. He had the good sense to understand in regard to the last one, that, in order to treat it successfully, he must master all the secrets of anatomy and physiology. This conviction led him into a course of study and investigation which until then he had never fully carried out, but which he followed to the end.

He believed in fact that in order to explain the soul he must study the material organism which it inhabits. He believed, besides, that in this mysterious domain one should not proceed by the synthetical method where one finds and asserts what one wishes, but by the analytical method by which one proclaims only what he is able to prove.

Those accustomed to philosophical studies know perfectly that the question of method is one of the

most complicated and the most difficult. The Socratic method and that of other great philosophers are interpreted in different ways. Few thinkers have explained fully the principles which directed them; hence the reciprocal relation of the parts of their systems may be understood in different ways. Few, indeed, have been faithful to the principles they have established, and it is almost always necessary to make a decided distinction between what the teaching should have been had it been completely logical, and what it really is.

I do not profess to say all that can be said about the method of the Prophet of the North, nor to present this difficult subject in its clearest light. I shall be satisfied to do my best, leaving our author, as far as possible, to explain himself, and supplementing his theories by the methods which he constantly employed in his religious works.

The first question we ask is: Did Swedenborg continue to follow during the period of his religious work the principles that guided him in his scientific work? To answer this question we must first learn what method he used up to the fifty-seventh year of his age. In the eyes of our writer, as in our own, philosophy is a structure erected by reason upon a foundation of science. According to him, there are three methods to be employed to arrive at true philosophy. The first is experience; in other words, experimental observations and the knowledge of facts; then follows an organic arrangement of these facts or phenomena, to which arrangement he gives the name rational philosophy and geometry; and finally the reasoning faculty, by which he understands the function of analyzing, comparing and combining these phenomena and presenting them clearly to the mind.

As will be seen, Swedenborg regards experience of the greatest importance, and gives it the place of honor; he is very modern in this respect. He

speaks in the same way of rational philosophy, though he wishes it to be spiritual. He also speaks of things which cannot be believed by any one

who has extinguished all spiritual ideas by the terms and definitions of human philosophy, or by argumentation, although the things themselves may be quite true.

We continue to quote:

The more the rational man thinks from the knowledges which are acquired by means of the senses, and from philosophical things, the less he grasps intellectual truths; for the illusions that thence arise are enveloped in so much the thicker obscurity.

Materialistic science appears to him, therefore, dangerous. He says again:

The knowledge of the ancients was altogether different from that of the present day. Their knowledge treated of the correspondence of things in the natural world with things in the spiritual world. The knowledge which is now called philosophy, such as that of Aristotle and others like him, was unknown to them. This is plain from the books of the earlier writers, most of which were written in language that signified, represented and corresponded to interior things. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 4966.)

Then follow several striking examples. He continues:

From these things it is plain what the learning of the ancients was, and that it led them into a knowledge of spiritual and heavenly things which at this day are scarcely known to exist. The knowledges which succeeded that of the ancients, and are properly called philosophy, rather draw away the mind from the knowledge of such things, because they can be applied to the confirmation of falsities too; and they also bring the mind into darkness when truths are confirmed by means of them, because, for the most part, they are bare expressions, whereby confirmations are effected, which are comprehended by few, and regarding which even those few are not agreed. From this it is evident how far mankind have receded from the erudition of the ancients, which led to wisdom. The Gentiles received those knowledges from the Ancient Church, the external worship of which consisted in representatives and significatives, and the

internal in those things which were represented and signified. (*Ibid.*, n. 4966.)

The scholastics do not go from thought to terms, but from terms to thoughts, and thus in a contrary way. And many of them do not even go to thoughts, but only stick in terms; and if they apply these, it is to prove whatever they wish, and to impose on falsities an appearance of truth, according to their desire of persuading. Hence to them philosophy is the means of becoming insane rather than of becoming wise, and hence they have darkness in place of light. . . . He who wishes to think artificially from terms is not unlike a dancer who wishes to learn to dance from the knowledge of the moving fibers and muscles; but if his thought should stick in this knowledge when he is dancing, he would scarce be able to move his foot; while yet without that knowledge he moves all the moving fibers scattered throughout his entire body, and in adaptation to them, the lungs, the diaphragm, the sides, the arms, the neck, and all the rest, for describing all of which, volumes would not suffice; and it is similar with those who wish to think from terms. . . . One must think continually of use, and from within. (*Ibid.*, n. 4658.)

Regarding those who "stick in terms" without "even going as far as the thought," I may be permitted to recall what Goethe said in his Faust, in a manner quite analogous. He puts the following lines in the mouth of Mephistopheles:

Meph. . . . Words, words alone are your best hope.
Stu. But in each word must be a thought —
Meph. There is, or we may so assume, —
Not always found, nor always sought,
While words — mere words, supply its room.
Words answer well, when men enlist 'em,
In building up a favorite system;
With words men dogmatize, deceive;
With words dispute, on words believe;
And be the meaning much or little,
The Word can lose nor jot nor tittle.

— *Trans. by Anster.*

I have spoken elsewhere of the marked influence which Swedenborg had upon the composition of Faust.

We have just seen that philosophy is described

by our author as rational, a term he frequently uses in his writings. The rational — a synonym of reason — is treated there in a singularly profound and complete manner. This term, with the adjective rational and the substantive rationality, occupies twenty-nine large pages of two columns in fine type, in Potts' Swedenborg Concordance. I would explain its meaning now, but that would lead me too far. I beg your indulgence until I come to that branch of my psychological work.

I must explain right here what Swedenborg means by geometry; he uses it as a synonym of rational philosophy, which at first thought is surprising. Geometry appears to me to be especially that absolute exactness and strict logic, which are the ideals of scholars, of mathematicians in particular. In fact he says: "The name of 'sciences' is given to experimental subjects of various kinds, physical, astronomical, chemical, mechanical, geometrical, anatomical, psychological, the histories of kingdoms, and in literature, criticism and the languages." According to this definition all branches of study belong to science, consequently the same method should be applied to all. Moreover all are profitable, provided they do not lead us into materialism. Unfortunately a great many scholars deny the Divinity and believe only in nature, — sensual men, who cannot recognize the good and the true because they are turned away from God. Nevertheless they are able to reason, often with more subtilty than others, but only from the illusions of the senses, confirmed by their natural knowledges. The Lord said of such men, "Seeing, they see not, hearing, they hear not, and do not understand," and again, "These things are concealed from the wise and understanding but revealed unto babes."

A passage in the "Apocalypse Revealed" shows more exactly the connection between geometry and theology:

That there is not a complete and perfect thing unless there is a trine, geometry also teaches; for a line is not anything, unless it becomes an area; and an area is not anything, unless it becomes a solid; therefore the one must be produced into the other, that they may exist; and they co-exist in the third. As it is in this, so is it in each and every created thing; they are finished in their third. Hence now it is that *three* in the Word, spiritually understood, signifies complete and altogether. Since it is so, I could not but wonder, that some profess faith alone, some charity alone, some works alone; when yet the one without a second, and two together without the third, are not anything. (N. 875.)

According to the above statement, which is explicit, geometry serves as a foundation for the entire system built by Swedenborg during the mystical and religious period of his career. The laws of geometry are obeyed in every domain, even in the highest, for it is a peculiarity as well as a mark of genius in our author to have conceived of an unchangeable order, which reflects the perfection of the Deity and which includes both parts of the universe, the visible world and the invisible.

All the theories consequently which he propounds must be in a way geometrical, and the fact that they are in accord with geometry serves as their demonstration. This is shown, for example, in some of his favorite doctrines: first the symbolic meaning of the number three, which is followed by the spiritual meaning of all the numbers; then the necessity of uniting faith with charity and good works so that the individual may be justified and saved by faith.

Another passage from the "True Christian Religion," shows how spiritual doctrines rest upon the natural sciences, especially upon geometry. Swedenborg gives a certain number of facts which, according to him, permit human reason to understand the infinity of God. The following is the eighth and last of these facts:

Besides all this there is a certain infinity in many things which fall into natural light and into spiritual light with man:

Into natural light, — that there are various series in geometry which go on to infinity; that between the three degrees of altitude there is progress to infinity, in that the first degree, which is called natural, cannot be perfected and elevated to the perfection of the second degree, which is called spiritual, nor this to the perfection of the third, which is called celestial. The case is similar with regard to end, cause, and effect; as that the effect cannot be perfected so that it may become as its cause, nor the cause so that it may become as its end.

This may be illustrated by the atmospheres, of which there are three degrees; for there is a higher aura, under this the ether, and below this the air; and no quality of the air can be elevated to any quality of the ether, nor any of this to any quality of the aura; and yet an elevation of perfections to infinity is possible in each.

Into spiritual light, — that natural love, which is that of a beast, cannot be elevated into spiritual love, which from creation was imparted to man; and that it is similar with the natural intelligence of a beast in relation to the spiritual intelligence of a man; but these things, because they are as yet unknown, will be explained in another place.

Thus it may be evident that the universals of the world are perpetual types of the infinity of God the Creator; but in what manner particulars emulate universals, and represent the infinity of God, is an abyss, and it is an ocean in which the human mind may, as it were, sail, but must beware of the tempest arising from the natural man, which from the helm where the natural man stands trusting in himself, will submerge the ship with its masts and sails. (True Christian Religion, n. 32.)

Several paragraphs of the "Spiritual Diary" maintain that geometry as well as other sciences, although good in themselves, are hazardous to those who have no perception of supernatural realities:

If any one gives himself up too much to mechanics he inclines his mind to the belief that all nature, including things spiritual and celestial, is a mere machine, both as a whole and in its parts. If he does not succeed in bringing it within the principles of mechanics and their forces, he no longer believes in anything, becoming thus purely corporeal and earthly. (Spiritual Diary, n. 768.)

As for geometry and everything like it, this science, so to speak, concentrates the mind and prevents it from going on to universals; moreover, it assumes that nothing exists but what

is geometric or mechanical. Now geometry does not extend beyond terrestrial and corporeal forms. (*Ibid.*, n. 769.)

The different kinds of knowledge are not harmful provided a man does not place everything in them, but has an ulterior end in view. For knowledges are spiritual riches on which the understanding of things can be founded. They resemble the treasures and powers of this world. If any one values them for themselves he becomes in the future life most perverse; if on the contrary he esteems them as mere means to attain higher ends they will do no harm either to him or any one else. (*Ibid.*, n. 773.)

The sciences are not of such a nature that they should be rejected, for they serve to confirm spiritual things. Thus the angels are infinitely better versed in all the sciences, even the most abstruse, than any one could imagine. But the learned of every class are almost all impelled either openly or in secret to reason about spiritual things, each according to his special science, and thus each is blinded by his own defect. Many among them argue from their different sciences in order to acquire a reputation for erudition; the philosophers from their science, the logicians and metaphysicians from theirs, and the same with the anatomists, geometricians, historians, politicians, etc., heaping up as the Jews did, phantasies and vain lucubrations. That is why the minds of the learned are closed to things spiritual and celestial; thus heaven itself, which is open to the ignorant, is closed to them. Who, in short, adores and deifies nature more than men skilled in the sciences. (*Ibid.*, n. 3460.)

The Lord [adds Swedenborg] granted me to conceive of forms completely transcending all geometric forms; for geometry is limited by the circle or by curves referring themselves to the circle, things which are merely terrestrial and do not even include the lowest atmospheric and aqueous forms. So I saw myself carried on to forms entirely deprived of limitations, and consequently freed from all relation to space and time. (*Ibid.*, n. 3484.)

Thus we have the true value of geometry made known to us by a great mathematician. Swedenborg gives it a place of importance among the sciences which relate to the study of the material world, and makes it especially the basis of his religious system; nevertheless he would not have the problems of life approached exclusively from the scientific side. According to him, one must receive

influx from the Lord and the teachings of His Word. Then only are natural knowledges vivified from within outward and find their legitimate place instead of formulating materialistic conclusions, which are outside of their sphere. Thus geometry — which measures space, and for that very reason confines itself to the material universe, — is one of the essential elements of theology, and more generally of the study of the things of the spirit; but, far from being the only one, it requires to be associated with elements of a higher order. In other words, if geometry is an authority in theological research, this temporal authority should be infilled with a spiritual authority which directs it and prevents it from falling into error. The method is complete and gives satisfying results only when it includes these two authorities, by subordinating the first to the second, that of science to that of religion.

As to the reasoning faculty which was equally necessary to the construction of his system, it requires no explanation. Clearly, one must reason to prove any sort of proposition, and this reasoning may be true or false by virtue of the liberty allowed to every man. It is just the same with reason, which, strictly speaking, is never wrong, but which in fact, from our individual inperfections often contradicts itself, and can declare itself for the false as well as for the true. If geometry, as has just been said, may be wrongly employed, that is to say used to convey false ideas or an erroneous principle, it is at least exact, indisputable, absolute in itself; on the contrary, reasoning may yield to every fallacy, be satisfied with appearances, and, as they say, throw dust in our eyes in small matters as well as great.

We are now ready to answer the question: "Did Swedenborg continue to follow in his religious period the principles which guided him during his scientific period?" Assuredly he did, because they were founded upon the knowledge of nature, which

comes from God, and on the laws of the human mind, which are unchangeable; but he was not satisfied with this; he saw that he must add other principles to these in going from the material to the spiritual kingdom. In fact while the world perceptible to our senses is ruled by geometry, and determinism, the supernatural world contains free forces which combine with forces from below and so far complicate our problems. This was why Swedenborg was obliged to enlarge his method. His manner of argument remains the same, but his field of experience is enlarged and two new authorities now claim his attention. I speak of the Holy Scriptures and Divine Influx.

These new authorities are not to be considered as conflicting with the former ones. The theologian is in perfect harmony with the scientist. The general belief is that there is a conflict between science and faith, between the intellect and the heart.

Swedenborg does not think so, for he has reconciled in his own mind the two powers, which until then were opposed to each other, and his system presents them to us united. The science of celestial things is superior to terrestrial science, but does not supersede it; each remains mistress in its own sphere, and the material simply gains by the influx of the spiritual.

This is a characteristic feature of Swedenborg's theology. Like Catholicism, Protestant orthodoxy still maintains dogmas incompatible with fixed conclusions, which students of the visible world have arrived at. Swedenborg is the first theologian who has fully respected material science, and placed religion beyond its attacks, by limiting it to the spiritual kingdom. For those who will listen to him, he has ended the deplorable conflict, which seemed to be eternal, between the aspirations of the religious soul and the demands of reason. It is this reconciliation of extremes, this harmony restored to the

human mind, with which I was most forcibly struck in the Swedenborg Congress assembled in London in 1910. Never in the history of mankind has an international assembly been so stamped with this admirable quality.

For some time our theologians have spoken of the Christian conscience as a principle which teaches them how to distinguish between the true and the false, and which helps them to systematize their beliefs. What has Swedenborg to say on this subject? To my mind he makes great use of this principle, without giving it the same name. His Christian conscience, more plainly than ours, is subordinated to the written Word, and the doctrines that flow from it. His criticism certainly does not lack courage, but he attributes much more positive value than our professors to the inspiration of the sacred Book, and he alone has defined what is meant by inspiration; for contemporary theology, dissatisfied with the beliefs held in this respect by ancient orthodoxy and by the Reformation, no longer dares to venture on this territory.

Moreover, it must be confessed that his idea of Divine inspiration is totally different from ours; not only is it clearer and more precise, but it contradicts ours. We have shown this frankly all along, without hiding the fact that this difference is an important one. Nevertheless, the spiritual sense set forth by our author, with the limited and more homogeneous canon of Scripture which results from it, is far from taking us to the literal biblicism of Dordascht or Gaussen. He even gives the death blow to literalism, which still flourishes today in certain quarters in the interpretation of the first chapters of Genesis, as well as in that of the prophecies of the Old and New Testaments concerning Israel, the nations, the end of the world, and the future life. Now, even if literalism, boldly supported by a superficial knowledge of history, still imposes

upon the credulous, incapable of investigating what is declared to them, it is not acceptable to those who are enlightened enough to judge for themselves; consequently it does religion more harm than good.

Moreover, the spiritual sense, once accepted, gives a new impulse to the Christian conscience, and to the higher criticism, which under its influence, are emboldened to pronounce upon questions until now guarded with a discretion which may be called culpable. The exegetist and the dogmatist are freed from a thousand petty fears which threaten to turn them from the path of freedom and right thinking. Religion developed from the internal sense of the Word is true spiritualism, spiritualism true and perfect, which contrasts favorably with the semi-materialism of the past, and which hails with joyful sympathy every advancement of science.

We have just recalled that Swedenborg regarded the Holy Scripture as the primary theological authority, and it has moreover been so regarded by all Protestantism for nearly four centuries.[1] The second authority, closely connected with the first, is the influx which true believers receive. Although the word "influx" belongs to the vocabulary of the Swedish writer, it designates, approximately at least, an authority received by all Protestants; I mean the influence of the Holy Spirit, without which we profess to be unable to comprehend the Bible or to assimilate its contents with any degree of profit. This doctrine, then, is not quite new, though Swedenborg has given it a form at once more exact and more extensive. This Divine influx is offered to all, but only hearts favorably disposed, and Christian souls are completely open to receive it. Still one must have attained an extraordinary degree of sanctification to be able to discover the internal sense concealed in the Word.

[1] Catholicism also recognizes the authority of the Scriptures, but subordinates it to that of the Church.

This is why the privilege was granted only to the Prophet of the North. This at least is what the New Church affirms.

You will doubtless raise the objection that influx claims a complete control, and I agree with you perfectly. If this influx were pure without any mingling with human elements, it would be an absolute authority; but the important question is to know, with regard to Swedenborg as well as all others, whether this be so in every case; whether his education, preconceived ideas, his personal tendencies did not lead him into mistakes upon this or that point. How can we be assured except by an impartial, serious and thorough examination? Moreover, we are not infallible ourselves, and our decisions will always reflect our mentality.

But one can make the same criticism of every authority. All claim an absolute control. All can be understood and applied in various ways. Take the Bible for example. According to what principle shall we interpret that? Your attention has been called to the great conflict between literalism and allegory. Besides that, how many minor difficulties! Not a verse that may not be explained in several ways. Every sect, every heresy, every social error, every abomination bases itself upon some text from the Bible. I may say as much of reason, under whose influence the Encyclopedists and the French Revolution wished to bring everything. What unreasonable things, what horrors even, have not been committed in its name. Doubtless pure reason would lead us to truth. But who can boast that his own reason is clear enough always to distinguish between the true and the false?

No, it is impossible after so many discouraging experiences to believe that the Absolute is accessible to us here below. Whatever be our authority in philosophy as well as in theology, the use we make of it depends upon our understanding, so weak, and

our will, still weaker. There are authorities that are legitimate, and others that are not. Above all, order must be established among the recognized authorities, and this order may be well or poorly comprehended. I hope I have succeeded in proving that Swedenborg was remarkably enlightened as to the authorities which should direct our religious thought, as I believe I have already shown that he was right in acknowledging the spiritual sense of the Word and influx. But I go no further. By no means do I ask you to believe that he was infallible. Was he sufficiently "illuminated" to give the true exegesis of all the Biblical passages of which he made a study, and to construct upon the Word of God as a basis a definite unassailable system? Every one is free to answer these two questions for himself. Happy should I be, if in his general lines of thought, for example, in our present subject, his method, I have convinced you that Swedenborg merits your confidence and even your admiration.

To these two new authorities a third element is added which serves to distinguish his theological method from his scientific. This element is strictly personal: Swedenborg presents himself as a seer. For a period of twenty-seven years altogether, from his fifty-seventh until his eighty-fourth year, he held almost daily communication with the inhabitants of the invisible world. He was firmly convinced of this himself, and he solemnly affirmed it upon his deathbed. According to his own testimony, categorical and reiterated, he saw and heard many supernatural things, which he relates in his works, and of which otherwise we should know nothing.

You will say it is difficult to believe this. I know that. Nevertheless the New Church believes it, and that Church comprises more than 15,000 members and 140 pastors. We have seen besides that its culture is on a remarkably elevated plane and that it includes many men of talent. But the Sweden-

borgians are not alone in believing in the possibility of conscious communication between the two shores separated by the dark river of death.

Since the middle of the last century, a very legitimate reaction against materialism and scepticism has manifested itself and is increasing today. People indifferent to religion, or wholly incredulous, have by hundreds of thousands come back to some little faith. They believe at least in the existence of God, life after death, and future reward. Various names are given to them: spiritists, theosophists, occultists, etc. But all agree in declaring that there is no brazen door forever locked, or an impassable gulf between the material and the spiritual world; that on the contrary, man is in constant communication with the departed. I am aware that these various groups are far from subscribing to the doctrines of Swedenborg. What I wish to point out is that a multitude of people, without forming a part of the church in general, are as well prepared as Christians, — and much more so than the Protestants — to believe in a seer, in a modern prophet, who, like the sacred writers, tells of symbolic visions, the appearance of angels, and even of the Lord himself, relating these things as facts, real and objective, which it is impossible to doubt.

Moreover, the doctrinal teaching of Swedenborg does not rest upon his visions, as is so often imagined. It is simply confirmed by them. His system of doctrine should be judged by the same criterion accorded to all other theologians, and be justified not by supernatural signs, but by its intrinsic worth. I have declared this repeatedly, and I shall not refer to it again. It is none the less true, that his "Memorable Relations" are intermingled with his whole theology, and that it is hardly possible to separate his system entirely from the mysterious elements of his career, that is to say from impressions that he received while he was

present in the spiritual world. At any rate, even though each one of us has the inalienable right to make a distinction for himself between the two domains — theology, properly speaking, and theosophy,* — it must be frankly acknowledged that Swedenborgians accept them both, receiving them by a single act of faith. In their eyes, Swedenborg is as much a seer, a revealer of the supernatural world, as an exegetist, a dogmatist and a moralist, measuring up to the highest standards of an enlightened age.[1]

But what I wish especially to point out here is, that even in regard to the most astonishing and extraordinary events that befell him, Swedenborg, who is so scrupulously sincere, intends to relate simply his actual experiences. He is as sure that he was transported into the intermediate world, or into one of the heavens, that he met there an old friend, a reformer, a pope, an empress, a philosopher or a celebrated scholar, that he conversed with them, upon this or that subject, that he was present at this discussion or that performance, as he is sure of perceiving natural things by means of his material senses. They are experiences of another kind, but to him they are none the less positive, no less clear, no less evident. And he knows how God made this possible; he knows that by a gift, not unique but exceptional, his internal senses were opened.

* This term is here used in a sense almost antiquated by the more recent meaning attached to it by the followers of Mme. Blavatsky.— *Editors.*

[1] So the *New-Church Quarterly* (July, 1913), reproached me for believing in a discretionary immortality rather than in an eternal hell. The pastors of the New Church accept all the religious teachings of Swedenborg, including what he saw and heard in the Beyond; on the contrary, I reserve to myself the right of criticism, convinced that no man, save Jesus Christ, is infallible. That is where I differ from them. Aside from this, I accept the whole of this system, which I declare to be superior to any other.

We may doubtless ask if these experiences of a mystical nature correspond with the reality. Many narratives of a like nature are the outcome of a simple piety exalted and superstitious. Every one knows that these visionaries are subject to illusions, that traditions become changed, and that legends spring up quickly. So, without resorting to the hypothesis of fraud, which in this case is inadmissible, the majority consider Swedenborg to have been the subject of frequent hallucinations. By virtue of a powerful imagination working upon the accumulations of an encyclopedic knowledge, he has, it is thought, constructed from all these materials an ideal world which he contemplated day after day as a substantial reality. Thus, unconsciously he gave an objective form to his dreams of the future life. This mingling of imagination with good faith, of superstition with truth, is common with mystics.

To this objection, very natural at first thought, I have several replies to make. In the first place, Swedenborg was not a mystic in the usual meaning of the word, though Emerson speaks of him as such in his "Representative Men." M. Bergson is fully informed on this subject and made the same observation to me of his own accord. Swedenborg was a scholar and a mathematician, an exceedingly practical engineer, a philosopher accustomed to minute analyses and subtle distinctions as well as to the widest generalizations.

While, then, he constantly affirms that these visions were granted him and that he heard celestial voices, and if therefore one is tempted to place him in the same rank as others who have had visions — Saint Theresa and Joan of Arc, Antoinette Bourignon, Madame de Lamothe-Guyon, Jane Leade, Jacob Boehme, Mélanie Mathieu à La Salette, and Bernadette Soubirous à Lourdes, — it must be acknowledged on the other hand, that his rare intellect, developed by the most intense studies, elevate him far above

enthusiastic and uneducated women, humble and ignorant peasants, and the shoemaker of Goerlitz. The French biographer of Swedenborg understood the immense superiority that such knowledge gave his hero over mystics, properly so-called, or the victims of hallucinations.

In the second place, let us note a superiority of another sort by which our theosophist is distinguished from those just mentioned. He nowhere claims to be the medium of a new revelation, but simply the inspired interpreter of our old Bible, the expositor of a higher conception of the eternal Gospel. His "voices" never enter into conflict with the written Word, which is always for him the supreme authority.[1]

Swedenborg is also distinguished from the mere mystics — and even from those in the Sacred Scripture to whom visions were accorded, by a third characteristic, namely, that he advances a theory capable of explaining these supernatural events. He remains faithful to his experimental method. What he tells us of his sojourns in the spiritual world are his own experiences. He declares that his internal eyes and ears were opened by a favor specially granted to him, but in the interests of his mission to humanity; and he is firmly persuaded that the testimony of his spiritual senses is as sure, even more sure, than the testimony, often deceitful, of his natural senses. He has a right, therefore, to rely upon his supernatural experiences, as much, at least, as he relies, with all of us, upon his experiences in the natural world. But in this respect, he resembles others who have had visions, who also believe in their own visions. What distinguished

[1] It may be that the reproach implied above is not merited by all mystics without exception. But mysticism has a decided tendency to separate itself from the Scriptures by subordinating their authority to that of direct communication from the other world.

him from them is his general system, which accounts clearly for these astonishing facts, and particularly his psychology, which attributes to our spiritual body the same senses as to our natural one. By his doctrines of degrees, of the external and the internal man, of the three heavens and the two kingdoms, by his whole conception of the universe, this system, for whosoever has taken the trouble to study it, strengthens the favorable impression made by his accounts of the world beyond the tomb, and appears to be a general proof of their truth. Never before Swedenborg has a seer explained his psychological state, and never before has any philosophy revealed the mystery of the exceptional relations between one to whom this peculiar power is granted and the invisible world.

At this point an important question suggests itself, "Can we personally repeat Swedenborg's experiences and so assure ourselves that they have an objective reality?" Let us try to solve this problem. I acknowledge willingly that experiences of this sort are exceedingly rare. Nevertheless, several most trustworthy individuals have had similar ones, notably the great apostles of positive religions.

According to the Bible, Abraham and the patriarchs, Moses and the Hebrew prophets, Jesus and his apostles, even holy women, and the first Christians, had by the opening of their internal senses communication with the spiritual world. I am aware that these miraculous narratives are challenged by the critic, and that he endeavors to explain away every historical feature; but in this, he has not yet succeeded. The church as a whole still believes that there are objective facts, real experiences granted to the better ones among us, showing the possibility of direct communication between earth and heaven.

"The Golden Legend,"—which relates in a charming manner the story of the Catholic saints by giving

to the supernatural so prominent a place, — is probably not quite trustworthy.

Nevertheless, that does not prove that the hypothesis of hallucinations, individual or collective, explains the principal " miracles " of the Old and New Testaments, and that rationalism or skepticism has triumphed over the supernatural. On the contrary, after a long period of unbelief, self-styled scientific, the upper circles of society in America and Europe have entered upon a phase of idealism, and a powerful current of spiritualism, occultism and theosophy, is impelling them once more towards religion. Thus — to quote only a single name — Sir Alfred Wallace, the rival of Darwin, accepts literally the miracles in the Bible, and endeavors to account for them by the intervention of spirits. Doubtless modern reason would no longer acknowledge miracles if it were obliged to see in them a setting aside of the laws of nature. These laws constituting Divine order should, we feel, be universal and unchangeable. But what is quite admissible even for the most enlightened minds is the influence of a superior sphere upon a lower one; for science is constantly proving the dominion of man over creation, the influence of the soul over the body, the subjection of matter to invisible forces. Why, then, should spirits and angels, whose existence is testified to by the Gospel, be deprived of all conscious relations with men of flesh and bones? There is no ground for this theory, to my mind. The possibility of such communication appears to me quite probable, if not as absolutely demonstrated.

Should the rarity of these conscious communications make us doubt their reality? I think not. Should they occur often, they would have the serious disadvantage of putting the creature before the Creator. The glorious king that would appear to us would have the effect of a divinity; we should bow to him, address our prayers to him, and no

longer acknowledge the invisible God. Thus in the Apocalypse the angel said to John, who was about to prostrate himself before him: "See thou do it not! I am thy fellow-servant. Worship God!"

Consequently, as I have just observed, the seers mentioned in the Bible were not, from a moral point of view, like the majority of their contemporaries, but they were generally distinguished by their firmness of faith and their strength of character. We justly admire as gigantic personalities, an Elias, a Hosea, an Isaiah, a Jeremiah, the apostles Peter, John, Paul, and above all Jesus Christ. If according to history or tradition such men as these had communication with the Beyond, they impress us still more by the justice and depth of their intuitions, by their love of country and of humanity, their bold independence and their courage amounting to heroism.

What shall we conclude from this? That there are conditions to be fulfilled to fit us to serve as a connecting link between heaven and earth, conditions religious and difficult. This privilege can only be granted to chosen men who have prepared themselves for it, by availing themselves, much more than other believers, of the spiritual resources of their age.

This statement agrees with the theory of discrete degrees, or degrees of altitude, which Swedenborg was the first to formulate. These three degrees — the natural, spiritual and celestial — can be opened successively in each one of us and place us in still more direct communication with the Lord; but they are only actually opened in each soul in the measure that is permitted by the state of his faith and love, or of his will and understanding. Like the *nâbis* of the old covenant who exercised so marked an influence upon their generation and those following, the apostles chosen and instructed by the Savior were faithful ones of a superior order. Their spiritual progress must have been the consequence of

the extraordinary opening of their minds to things above. So, according to the New Testament, they were able to see and understand what most Christians of their time, faulty and imperfect, could neither see nor comprehend. It is not at all surprising that they sometimes had conscious communication with the angels. Moreover, all Christianity has admitted this without dispute for nineteen centuries.

But what of Swedenborg himself in this respect? Was his mediumship — to use a modern expression — like that of the Biblical theosophists just mentioned? It seems to me that it was, and I will give you my reasons. With a mind so well poised and steadfast, and especially with his scientific habits, he was not at all given to superstition. Moreover, he has given proofs of too constant and sincere a humility to be accused of cherishing such a stupendous illusion which could be explained only on the ground of self-conceit. Indeed, to believe himself privileged above all men by the opening of his spiritual senses in order that he might interpret the Scriptures rationally and build upon this exegesis a system of doctrine superior to all others, — to believe this were it not true would have been an unheard-of infatuation on his part, an enormous hypertrophy of personality and an actual profanation, that is to say, according to his own theology, the sin most difficult to eradicate.

Finally, during the whole mystical period of his career, Swedenborg devoted himself to the study of the Sacred Books. He commented on them with an extraordinary sagacity, and all he has written about them appears to be impregnated with their spirit. Never has a conception embracing at the same time Christianity and the universe been more purely religious, rested more directly upon the Revelation of God in the Gospel, and developed more harmoniously its essential elements. After this, how can we pretend to place this seer in the ranks of

the false prophets, that is to say, of imposters, or of the insane? Aside from these special arguments, the biography which I have sketched I believe quite impartially shows that my hero had not only a most sincere, cultivated and powerful mind, but also the clearest of conscience, and a most finely tempered and the best balanced character, but that his conduct wholly conformed to the indisputable principles of Christianity.

There are very few men, of whose life, public or private, so much has been written, whether by themselves, their immediate associates or by their opponents. Yet it seems to me difficult, not to say impossible, to mention a distinguished Christian who has shown by indisputable proofs a piety so free from all self-seeking, so consistent and practical, a spirituality so perfect and impressive. Pass in review bishops and popes, anchorites and fathers of the Church, reformers, revivalists, philanthropists; not one of them all appears to have attained the spiritual stature of Swedenborg, not one who is not guilty of at least one conspicuous misdeed, not one who does not exhibit some passion or weakness from which the Prophet of the North is exempt.[1]

I seem to exaggerate, but I express a sentiment here which my studies have every day confirmed. Moreover, I am not alone in giving to Swedenborg so high a place in the history of humanity. Consider the thousands of his followers scattered throughout the world, and especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries. Read again if necessary the enthusiastic testimony of illustrious writers who since the past century have discovered the Seer of Stockholm, and felt his grandeur.

[1] The comparison would be still more to the advantage of Swedenborg were I speaking of his whole life, which was uniformly pure and sincere, while others were obliged to experience a striking conversion. Augustine, for example, before becoming a saint and a light of the church, gave himself up until he was thirty-two years old to love of the world and pleasure.

Certainly he did not take upon himself any high-sounding title, and this humility clearly distinguishes him from the head of the Catholic Church as well as from the founder of positivism. He wished to be simply a "servant" of Jesus Christ, yet he inscribed even this modest designation only in the last of his works.

But that is no reason for denying his exceptional worth. We cannot consider him as inferior, spiritually, to the prophets of Israel, to the twelve, and to Saint Paul, to Origen and Augustine, to Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli, to Wesley, Spence or Zinzendorf.

We know that piety is always in accord with the correctness and the extent of knowledge; in other words, that the receiving of faith and the direction of charity depend in a very considerable measure upon the manner in which each one thinks of God and religion. Now Swedenborg was persuaded that he taught a system of doctrine truer than that of the sixteenth century, and particularly an explanation, at once Biblical and rational, of the doctrine of the Trinity, and a new principle for the interpretation of the Scriptures. He further believed that by accomplishing this mission, for which he was only an unworthy instrument in the hands of the Lord, he was inaugurating a better era for the Church, the New Dispensation foretold in Revelation by the Holy City descending from God out of heaven, all glorious with gold, crystal, and precious stones.

So we think, with many others, that he was qualified to be chosen to re-establish communication so long interrupted between earth and heaven, for the sake of the salvation of the human family, a salvation which is the supreme care of the Lord. He fulfilled the moral and religious conditions which were indispensable to this sublime commission. If his work was indeed extraordinary, supernatural, we should recognize the fact that it came about in

the order of Divine Providence. It is, in fact, a law of the Kingdom of God, that certain spiritual qualifications are necessary for every ministration that is to be performed in the Church, and that the highest qualifications are needed for the most difficult, the most general and the most important. This conclusion is not self-evident, I am the first to acknowledge. But it is impossible that it should be so while the principal doctrines of the Gospel — the Divinity of the Redeemer, the inspiration of the written Word, and even the existence of God — are either disputed or denied by many serious and intelligent men. To find the truth which saves, one must seek it earnestly with the firm intention of practicing it.

Now, how can one form a rational opinion of the Swedish theosophist, if one does not take the trouble — I will not say of reading him, but of knowing at least something of what he was, what he did, what he taught, and what he wished to do? Whatever may be the validity of the proofs of Christianity, they will never impress themselves upon every mind; to feel their force, there is always essential in the first place a hunger and thirst after righteousness — in other words, a willingness of heart.

CHARLES BYSE.

SWEDENBORG'S INFLUENCE UPON GOETHE.*

By Waldo Cutler Peebles.

OWING to the ignorance and misunderstanding which commonly obscure the name and fame of Swedenborg, even at the present day, it seems expedient to preface an essay in which his influence is to play so large a part with a brief account of his life and of his contributions to science, although the main facts of such an account are to be found in any reputable encyclopædia.

Emanuel Swedenborg, the Swedish scientist, philosopher, and mystic, was born at Stockholm in 1688. He completed the university course at Upsala in 1710, and then undertook a European tour, visiting England, Holland, France, and Germany. Among his earliest publications were Latin verses, some of them in honor of King Charles XII. His early proficiency in Latin explains, perhaps, why the great bulk of his scientific and theological works are written with so much facility in that language. From 1716-1718 he published a record of mechanical and mathematical inventions and discoveries entitled *Dædalus Hyperboreus*. Many of the inventions described in this publication were mentioned in a letter to his father in 1714. An examination of a long list discloses the remarkable fact that Swedenborg had conceived the idea of the submarine, that instrument which is threatening to revolutionize modern naval strategy. He refers to it as: "The plan of a certain ship, which, with its men, can go under the surface of the sea, whenever it chooses, and do great damage to the fleet of

* This paper was written originally as a thesis to be submitted to the Division of Modern Languages and Literatures at Harvard University for Final Honors in German. It was awarded Honors (*magna cum laude*), and also the Sohier Prize for the best thesis in the field of Modern Literature. — *Editors.*

the enemy" (Benj. Worcester's Life and Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg, p. 42).

One of these inventions was used by Swedenborg in rendering a very patriotic service to his king and country. In the operations connected with the siege of Fredericks-hall he transported by mechanical devices two galleys, five large boats, and a sloop, seventeen miles overland, from Strömstadt to Iderfjol.

In 1716 Swedenborg was appointed by Charles XII to the office of Assessor Extraordinary of the Royal College of Mines. It is said that the reports he submitted on smelting and assaying were remarkable. Shortly after this date, his family was ennobled, and he took his seat in the Swedish House of Knights and Nobles. It was then that the extra syllable "en" was added to his name (it was originally Swedberg), which corresponds to the German "von" of nobility. His contributions to political discussions on such subjects as currency, decimal system, balance of trade, and liquor laws, had great influence. In 1724 he declined an offer of the Chair of Mathematics at Upsala.

There is no doubt that Swedenborg anticipated many scientific facts and positions that are usually regarded as of much more modern date.[1] It was only towards the end of the 19th century that his voluminous writings began to be properly collected and examined, with the result that there was hardly one department of scientific activity in which he was not found to be far ahead of his time. His work on palæontology shows him the predecessor of all the Scandinavian geologists. Contributions in this field alone are enough to perpetuate his fame. He was a great physicist and arrived at a nebular theory long before Kant and Laplace. He was the first to employ mercury for the air-pump. He devised a method of determining longitudes at sea by observations of the moon among the stars. He took a lively interest in machine-guns, and even sketched a plan for a flying machine. Swedenborg showed one hun-

[1] The substance of this and the next paragraph is taken from the Encyclopædia Britannica.

dred and fifty years before any other scientist that the motion of the brain is synchronous with respiration and not with the action of the heart or the circulation of the blood; also that the brain is the seat of the activities of the soul. His views as to the physiological functions of the spinal cord are in agreement with modern research. He anticipated many of the pre-eminent offices of the ductless glands which are now only beginning to be discovered. He found the function of the until recently supposed useless appendix.

Without reference to Swedenborg's long list of works, suffice it to say that he spent a considerable part of his life travelling in Germany, France, and Italy in quest of the most eminent teachers and best books dealing with the human frame. His problem was to discover the nature of the soul and spirit by means of anatomical and physiological studies. In 1745 he decided that this problem could not be solved in this way, and that he could not succeed in grasping the infinite and the spiritual through the natural sciences alone. At this time a profound change came over him, and he turned toward the work of recording his spiritual experiences. These furnished the basis of that remarkable theological system which gained him the doubtful reputation of a mystic during his lifetime, but is now winning him more universal recognition and more lasting fame than even his great scientific achievements. He spent much time in Amsterdam and London seeing to the publication of his works. It was in the latter city that he died in 1772.

When the above account is considered in connection with the well-known facts of Goethe's career, we find that the lives of Swedenborg (1688-1772) and Goethe (1749-1832) overlapped twenty-three years. This means that it was possible for Goethe to become acquainted with Swedenborg's writings at the age of his greatest impressionability, his student days, and at the very time when these writings were circulating widely among German scholars, and when mystical stories of Swedenborg were extensively told among

the German people. Goethe and Swedenborg belonged to kindred branches of the Teutonic race. They were certainly akin in nobility of soul, capacity of mind, and aptitude for work; for the position held by Swedenborg as scholar, scientist, philosopher, practical administrator, and man of affairs was also held by Goethe with the additional qualification of poet. It can only be regretted that two such intellectual giants never came into personal relations. Goethe did, however, acquire points of contact with the great Swede through other Germans. These indirect connections can best be established by an account of Swedenborg's influence upon some of Goethe's predecessors and contemporaries in the German intellectual world.

A very important connection between Swedenborg and German literature is formed by Kant's "Träume eines Geistersehers" ("Dreams of a Spirit-Seer"), published in 1766. By means of this controversial work Kant tries to explain the delusions of the metaphysicians of his time, and to annihilate them and Swedenborg with them by his bitter scorn and cynical wit. Kuno Fischer says:[2]

> That the "Dreams of a Spirit-Seer" was a humorous critique aimed chiefly at the philosophers of his day, using Swedenborg as a convenient because non-combative and comparatively unknown mark for his blows, is now generally conceded. But the century and a half that have elapsed since that time have brought Swedenborg out of his obscurity into light, and his real relation to Kant and the latter's great indebtedness to him is now first seriously arousing the attention of the students of German philosophy.

Part Second of the "Dreams" deals entirely with Swedenborg. It is composed of three chapters. The first, from which I shall quote later, is entitled "A story, the truth of which the reader is recommended to investigate as he likes." The second chapter is "A Dreamer's Ecstatic Journey through the World of Spirits," and in it Kant gives his readers a really fair presentation of what he

[2] Geschichte der neu. Phil., Bd. III, p. 232; 2nd. Ed., 1869. This reference was obtained from Dr. Sewall's preface to Kant's "Dreams."

himself has absorbed of Swedenborg's spiritualistic experiences from reading the "Arcana," published 1749-56, which he bought. Of this he says:

> The big work of this author comprises eight volumes quarto full of nonsense. He puts them before the world as a new revelation under the title of "Arcana Cœlestia." . . . The author's style is plain. His stories and their arrangement seem to be based upon fanatic observation, and afford little reason to suspect that fancies of a wrongly speculating reason have moved him to invent them, and use them for deception. (Dreams, p. 102.)

Kant's last chapter bears the title, "Practical Conclusion from the Whole Treatise," and is in the nature of a general warning. He advises that it is best to ignore experiences about the spiritual world as one would rumored ghost-stories. Those who inquire so anxiously about the other world had best have patience until they get there.

Dr. Sewall shows in his preface that Kant[3] little foresaw that he would some day find the basis of his positive idealism only in those principles of the "Arcana" which he once affected to despise. Four years later in his inaugural dissertation of 1770 he chose the very theme the vision of which he destroys in the "Dreams"—that, namely, of a *mundus intelligibilis et mundus sensibilis*. This may explain why Kant gave instructions to his editor Tieftrunk not to include in a collection of his minor writings those earlier than 1770, thereby omitting the "Dreams."

Dr. Tafel, of the University of Tübingen, thinks that it was Kant's fear of ridicule among his philosophical colleagues that led him to affect so trifling an attitude toward an author who had in reality deeply and lastingly impressed him. This opinion seems to be borne out by passages from Kant's letters[4] to Moses Mendelssohn. From the letter of Feb. 7, 1766:

[3] In the "Kritik der reinen Vernunft" (1781) and the "Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft" (1793).

[4] "Dreams," Appendix IV. Original source: Kant's Werke: ed. Rosenkranz u. Schubert, XI, 1, 1842.

I have sent you by post some "Träumereien," and beg most respectfully that after retaining a copy yourself, if you so please, you will send the others to Court-Preacher Sack, to the Councillor of the Consistory Spaulding, to Provost Süsmilch, to Professors Lambert, Sultzer, and Formey. It is a hastily prepared treatise, and presents rather an outline of the manner in which questions of this kind may be treated than the treatment itself.

From the letter of April 8, 1766:

As a matter of fact it would be difficult for me to conceive of a method of so clothing my thoughts that I shall not subject myself to ridicule. It seemed to me the wisest course to take advantage of others and first do the ridiculing myself; and in this I have been perfectly frank since the attitude of my own mind is inconsistent and, so far as these stories are concerned, I cannot help having a slight inclination for things of this kind, and indeed, as regards their reasonableness, I cannot help cherishing an opinion that there is some validity in these experiences in spite of all the absurdities involved in the stories about them, and the crazy and unintelligible ideas which deprive them of their real value.

There is only one conclusion to be drawn from these two letters; namely, Kant had two very different opinions of Swedenborg, a private and a public one. This deduction is confirmed by another quotation from Kant in which he expresses his alarm on finding some of his own views anticipated by Swedenborg:

The system of Swedenborg is unfortunately very similar to my own philosophy. It is not impossible that my rational views may be considered absurd by reason of that affinity. As to the offensive comparison, I declare, we must either suppose greater intelligence and truth at the basis of Swedenborg's writings than first impressions excite, or that it is a mere accident when he coincides with my system, — a "lusus naturæ." Such a wonderful agreement exists between his doctrines and the deepest results of reason, that there is no other alternative whereby the correspondence can be explained. (Worcester's Life and Mission, p. 125. Source, Kant: Leipzic, 1838, III, 95.)

Kant accomplished two things by the publication of the "Dreams." By subjecting Swedenborg to his unjust ridicule he cast such suspicion upon his name that the greatest

German writers were henceforth chary of mentioning it or acknowledging his influence. Even ridicule, however, is sometimes an effective means of advertising. Kant was the first German to take notice in print of Swedenborg's activities and to record the stories then circulating about his mystical powers, thus lending them the confirmation which his authority gave. The following extract is presented in all fairness:

> There lives at Stockholm a certain Mr. Swedenborg, a gentleman of comfortable means and independent position. His whole occupation for more than twenty years is, as he himself says, to be in closest intercourse with spirits and deceased souls; to receive news from the other world, and, in exchange, give those who are there tidings from the present; to write big volumes about his discoveries; and to travel at times to London to look after their publication. He is not especially reticent about his secrets, talks freely about them with everybody, seems to be entirely convinced of his pretensions, and all without any apparent deceit or charlatanry. Just as he, if we may believe him, is the Arch-Spiritseer among all the spiritseers, he certainly is also the Arch-Dreamer among all the dreamers, whether we judge him by the description of those who know him, or by his works. But this will not hinder those who, otherwise, are favorable to influences from spirits, from supposing that there is some truth back of such phantasms. . . . I must quote from what is spread abroad to authenticate the extraordinary capacities of the above-mentioned gentleman, at least that which, with most people, still finds some credit. (Dreams, p. 92.)

The "three proofs" which Kant records afterwards became widely known, and are mentioned by Herder and Jung-Stilling.

These three proofs which demonstrated Swedenborg's visionary powers to the satisfaction of eye-witnesses were, briefly:* (1) The disclosure to Queen Ulrica of Sweden of a secret conversation held with her brother, the lately deceased Prince of Prussia, Augustus William, brother to

* For a full account of these clairvoyant experiences see Tafel's "Documents concerning Swedenborg," II, 613–692, or Worcester's "Life and Mission," Ch. XIV, or Kant's "Dreams."

Frederick the Great; (2) the discovery for a certain Dutch lady of the whereabouts of a lost receipt known only to her deceased husband; (3) the announcement, and what subsequently proved to be an accurate description, of a fire raging in Stockholm, Swedenborg being at the time many miles distant in Gothenburg.

It is interesting to note in passing that Klopstock once paid a visit to Swedenborg in Copenhagen.[5] Without going into the details of this meeting it may be said that this was, perhaps, the beginning of Klopstock's interest in Swedenborg. The strong influence which Klopstock exerted upon Goethe is well known. Professor Francke[6] shows how Klopstock, inspired, at least indirectly, by Swedenborg, incorporates his theories on the nature of heavenly spirits into the "Messias," Canto 16, verses 320-331. Goethe made use of this passage in his representation of the change that comes over the Blessed Boys and over Faust himself in the last scene of "Faust II," as we shall see later.

It is a much debated question how and when Goethe first came to know of Swedenborg's writings. I have found evidence which indicates that both Fräulein von Klettenberg and Herder possessed these writings, and discussed them with Goethe. As Goethe came under the influence of Fräulein von Klettenberg several months before going to Strassburg and meeting Herder, it seems certain that she was the first to make Swedenborg known to him. It seems likely, then, that Herder amplified and confirmed a knowledge which Goethe already had. In any case, it is unnecessary to split hairs as to priority in the matter, because he went directly to Strassburg after the studies which he carried on with Fräulein von Klettenberg during his illness of a year and a half (Sept. 1768 to March 1770) at Frankfurt. It is quite probable that Goethe continued his talks with Fräulein von Klettenberg about Swedenborg

[5] Tafel: Document 279. Account contained in the *Berlinische Monatschrift*, Vol. XI, 1788, p. 516. Also in Döring's "Life of Klopstock."

[6] Kuno Francke: The "Blessed Boys" in Faust and Klopstock. *Modern Philology*, April, 1905, pp. 461-462.

on his return to Frankfurt, and with new enthusiasm after his association with Herder. There can be no doubt, however, who influenced him first. The extent of the two influences is, according to Bielschowsky and Lewes, a matter of conjecture; that these influences existed, I shall now show.

A valuable discovery, at least for the purposes of this thesis, was that of a little essay among Fräulein von Klettenberg's literary remains, entitled "Von Himmel und von der himmlischen Freude" ("About Heaven and the Heavenly Joy"). J. Weis declares this little work to be a German translation[7] of Swedenborg's "Arcana Cœlestia," numbers 449-454. Another later essay clearly shows Swedenborgian influence, especially that of his work on "Conjugial Love." Lavater mentions this last essay in his diary, June 27, 1774. It is extremely likely that Goethe wrote this document himself, and that he and Fräulein von Klettenberg placed it as their own views over against Lavater's "Aussichten in die Ewigkeit" ("Expectations in Eternity"), which was written in 1772. Hans Schlieper[8] vouches for this theory, and to support it quotes from a criticism[9] by Goethe of this very work, in which he says:

> Dazu wünschen wir ihm innige Gemeinschaft mit dem gewürdigten Seher unserer Zeiten, rings um den die Freude des Himmels war, zu dem Geister durch alle Sinnen und Glieder sprachen, in dessen Busen die Engel wohnten. (P. 36.)
>
> (We wish him intimate intercourse with the honored seer of our times, who was surrounded by the joy of Heaven, to whom spirits spoke through all his senses and members, in whose bosom the angels dwelt.)

Goethe continues and compares Lavater with Swedenborg, calling him:

> Eine Seele, die in dem grossen Traum von Weltall, Sonnendonnern und Planetenrollen verloren, sich über das Irdische

[7] Max Morris thinks it possible that Goethe translated this himself.

[8] In his doctor's thesis, listed in my bibliography.

[9] In the *Frankfurter Gelehrte Anzeiger*, Nov. 3, 1773.

hinauf entzückt, Erden mit dem Fuss auf die Seiten stösst, tausend Welten mit einem Finger leitet und dann wieder in dem Leib versetzt, für die Mikromegischen Gesichte, Analogie in unsern Kräften, Beweisstellen in der Bibel ausklaubt. (P. 37.)

(A soul, which lost in the great dream of the universe, of the thundering of suns and the rolling of planets, transports itself above the earthly plane, casts earths aside, conducts a thousand worlds with one finger and then transplanted again into the flesh, finds analogy for the phenomena of the miniature world in our faculties, and chooses passages from the Bible in evidence.)

Schlieper maintains that the above-quoted language of Goethe is Swedenborgian in tone and content. There seems to be adequate proof, then, that:

Goethes Lektüre Swedenborgischer Schriften ersteckt sich über die erste Hälfte der siebziger Jahre; wahrscheinlich las er Swedenborg nur in Frankfurt, wo die Klettenberg dessen Schriften schätzte und wohl auch besass. (P. 45.)

(Goethe's reading of Swedenborgian writings extends through the first half of the Seventies; probably he read Swedenborg only in Frankfort where Klettenberg appreciated his writings and also owned some of them.)

It would be difficult to explain just how Fräulein von Klettenberg[10] came into possession of Swedenborg's works; but Herder, the preacher and scientist, was just the man to know of Swedenborg, and possessed those peculiar qualities which are necessary for the highest appreciation of his system. No doubt Herder knew of Swedenborg first through Kant,[11] but the actual document must soon have fallen into his hands; for Swedenborg was accustomed to send copies of his works to universities and to noted men. In any case, the following extracts from Herder's "Adras-

[10] Max Morris agrees with Schlieper that, as he says in his essay, p. 505, Goethe was first brought into contact with Swedenborg about 1771 by Fräulein von Klettenberg, whose circle was known for its "mystic tendencies."

[11] Schlieper, p. 38. Herder got his knowledge of Swedenborg from Kant, who studied only the "Arcana."

tea" (1802), show that he had made some study of Swedenborg's life, and was familiar with his writings:

Im vergangenen Jahrhundert gab es einen kenntniss- und erfahrungsreichen Mann,[12] der von den Einwohnern der Planeten und Sterne, von ihren Geistern, ja von den Geistern aller Himmel und Welträume *wachend* träumte. Er sprach mit diesen Geistern, sie mit ihm, eine Gedankensprache. Sie sahen *durch* seine Augen (denn sonst sehen sie, wie er erzählt, Dinge unserer Erde nicht), er empfand sie in diesem und jenem Theil seines Körpers, vorzüglich in oder vor seinem Haupt, mehr und minder entfernt. Dreissig Jahre lebte er im Umgang mit diesen Geistern, aus welchem er der Welt zwanzig kleine und grosse Schriften, rein und schön in Quart gedrückt, von ihm selbst sorgsam durchsehen, mitgetheilt hat; denn er schrieb bis in sein fünfund-achtzigstes Jahr, in welchem er starb. Sein Andenken dauert noch fort; eine Religionssecte in England und in Amerika führt sogar seinen Namen. Verdiente dies menschliche Phänomenon nicht eine nähere Erwägung? (Pp. 501–2.)

(In the past century there lived a man rich in knowledge and experience, who dreamed (while awake) about the inhabitants of the planets and stars, and about their spirits, indeed he used to dream about the spirits of all the heavens and universes. He used to talk a thought-language with these spirits and they with him. They used to see through his eyes (for in no other way, so he relates, can they see things of our earth). He used to perceive them in various parts of his body, particularly in or in front of his head, more or less distant. He lived thirty years in intercourse with these spirits, about which he has imparted to the world twenty small and great writings, neatly printed in quarto volumes carefully revised by himself; for he wrote up to his eighty-fifth year, in which he died. His memory is still very much alive; a religious sect in England and America even bears his name. Did not this human phenomenon deserve a closer consideration?)

Herder then gives a concise and appreciative sketch of Swedenborg's life and scientific activities up to this point:

Denn schon im Jahr 1743 war ihm, wie er sagt, der Herr erschienen, hatte ihm das Innre aufgethan und die Geisterwelt eröffnet, auch verstattet, mit Engeln und Geistern zu sprechen, in deren Umgange er fortan bis an seinen Tod lebte. Er sahe

[12] The title of this essay in "Adrastea" is "Emanuel Swedenborg, der grösste Geisterseher des 18ten Jahrhunderts."

sich als eine *Verbindung* zwischen der Geister- und Körperwelt, diesen Umgang sogar als ein Amt an, das ihm der Herr aufgetragen, und zeigte dabei weder einen anmassenden Stolz noch eine Schwäche des Verstandes. Kein Prahlen machte er davon, wusste aber, wenn er darüber gefragt ward, auch die Spötter[13] in Achtung zu erhalten. (P. 502.)

(For already in the year 1743, so he says, the Lord had appeared to him, had opened his innermost and revealed to him the spiritual world. He had also allowed him to converse with angels and spirits, in whose companionship he now lived continually until his death. He regarded himself as a connecting link between the spirit and corporeal world, and even looked upon this intercourse as an office (or duty) which the Lord had laid upon him, and displayed in the performance of it neither an arrogant pride nor any weakness of the intellect. He made no boasting of it, but had the faculty when questioned of imposing respect even upon scoffers.)

Herder is evidently convinced of Swedenborg's sincerity, but believes him "ein Selbstbetrogener" (one who is self-deceived) through the misuse of his "Phantasie." From this example he takes occasion to warn other poetical geniuses not to give unlimited scope to their imagination. He gives a psychological explanation of Swedenborg's visions; namely, that Swedenborg saw and believed these phantasies which sprang from his innermost self because conviction of the truth of these appearances made them inner realities and presented them to his senses as such. "Himmel und Hölle waren aus und in ihm, eine Laterna magica seiner eignen Gedanken." ("Heaven and hell were out of and in him, a magic lantern of his own thoughts.") Herder refers to the cases of the three clairvoyant "proofs," and explains them inadequately. He dodges the issue by saying that they are mere stories and hearsay which prove nothing. "Und ein verständiger Mann, der vor allem andern sein Traumvermögen in Thätigheit gesetzt hat, auch wachend muss er viel austräumen." ("And an intelligent man, who more than any one else has set his ability to dream into activity, must dream out much even while awake.") In this hesitancy of Herder to believe well-

[13] He did this on the occasion of Klopstock's visit.

attested facts which he admits to be phenomenal and worthy of careful consideration, we may discern the baleful influence of Kant's "Träume." The deeply rooted prejudice and the mysterious consensus among learned German scholars to mention the name of Swedenborg as little as possible may be traced to the pernicious effects of that little book.

However interesting the above extracts may be in evidencing the extent of Swedenborg's influence upon Herder, it was long before the publication of "Adrastea" that Herder and Goethe first discussed Swedenborg together. On page 66 of Herder's "Origin of Language," [14] published by him in 1772, we read:

> Swedenborg was necessitated to take his angels and spirits from the different senses, and the sublime Klopstock, the greatest antithesis to Swedenborg, could not build up his heaven and hell without the aid of sentient materials.

The importance of this seemingly slight reference to Swedenborg is established by Goethe's statement in "Dichtung und Wahrheit" [15] ("Fiction and Truth") that the "Ursprung der Sprachen" ("Origin of Language") was a prize essay which Herder allowed him to read in manuscript form before publication. Goethe also says that Herder was writing this essay during his sojourn at Strassburg, when the two friends were on the most intimate terms and spent whole days together in discussion. It is scarcely too much to infer, then, that Goethe came across this reference to Swedenborg and was rejoiced to find that the object of his studies with Fräulein von Klettenberg at Frankfurt was also known and appreciated by his new friend, Herder.

I have built up in the preceding pages a somewhat complicated, and perhaps wearisome, structure of references and quotations indicating by what channels Swedenborg's

[14] My reference is to an English translation of the "Ursprung der Sprachen," which was hard to procure in the original German.

[15] Book X, pp. 336–7, of edition listed in my bibliography.

influence entered the German literary world, and when and how this influence extended to Goethe, in order to have a firm basis of proof upon which to stand in discussing "Faust." "Faust" is the work in which Goethe's Swedenborgianism finds its fullest expression, just as it is the one in which are contained and summed up all the influences, theories, experiences, and ideals which were determining forces in Goethe's life. It is clear, however, that such a strong impression from Swedenborg as is shown in "Faust" must be recorded elsewhere in Goethe's writings. We shall now pause to take note of these passages, scattered and unimportant as they may be in themselves, and leave for a fitting climax the consideration of Swedenborg in Goethe's greatest work.

Morris[16] says these passages do not show as careful utilization of Swedenborg's whole system, as in Faust, but they do exhibit as quite unusual tendency for populating the world with spirits. We shall list first citations from letters (taken from Morris in *Euphorion* for 1899, page 504 and following):

An Herder, Ende 1771: "Der himmlische Grimm der rächenden Geister säuselte um mich herum."

(To Herder, end of 1771: "The heavenly fury of avenging spirits hummed and buzzed around me.")

An Jakobi, 21, August, 1774: "Oft wohnte ich mit Jappachs Geist."

(To Jacobi, Aug. 21, 1774: "I often dwelt with Jappach's spirit.")

An Auguste Stolberg, 25, Juli 1775: "Der gute Geist,[17] der um uns alle schwebt, wird ihm gelinden Balsam in die Seele giessen." An dieselbe, 3 August 1775: "Ich hab Ihnen beschrieben, wie's um mich herum aussieht, um die Geister durch den sinnlichen Blick zu vertreiben."

---

[16] I must acknowledge indebtedness to Max Morris for pointing out these passages, of which I have chosen the most important in order to make my thesis as complete as possible in evidence.

[17] This is a suggestion of a guardian spirit.

(To Auguste Stolberg, July 25, 1775: "The good spirit, which hovers about all of us, will pour sweet balsam into his soul." To the same, Aug. 3, 1775: "I have described to you how it looks about me here in order to dispel the spirits through the sensual glance.")

An Lavater, 1781: "Ich bin geneigter als jemand noch eine Welt ausser der Sichtbaren zu glauben und ich habe Dichtungs- und Lebenskraft genug, sogar mein eigenes beschränktes Selbst zu einem Swedenborgischen Geisteruniversum erweitert zu fühlen."

(To Lavater, 1781. "I am more inclined than any one to believe in another world beside the visible one and I have enough poetic power and vital power to feel even my own circumscribed self expanded to a Swedenborgian universe of spirits.")

In a letter to Frau von Stein, November 19, 1776, Goethe, among a lot of articles enumerated, mentions the possession of "Swedenborg." The fact is (see *ibid.*, p. 508) that Goethe purchased a German translation of one of Swedenborg's works in this year. The symbolical language of subsequent letters is due to the reading of his new acquisition.

An Frau von Stein, 1777: "Wege mitunter!! In dreckigen Jerusalem Schwedenborgs is nichts gröber."

(To Frau von Stein, 1777: "Such awful roads! Nothing is more uncouth in the dirty Jerusalem of Swedenborg.")

An Charlotte von Stein, 1, Oktober 1781: "Durch seine (Grimms) Augen wie ein Schwedenborgischer Geist will ich ein gross Stüch Land sehen."

(To Charlotte von Stein, October, 1781: "Through his (Grimm's) eyes I will like a Swedenborgian spirit see a great stretch of land.")

An Frau Rath, 3, Oktober, 1781: "Wenn man nach Art Schwedenborgischer Geister durch fremde Augen sehen will, thut man am besten, wenn man Kinder Augen dazu wählt."

(To Frau Rath, Oct. 3, 1781: "When one wants to see through the eyes of another after the fashion of Swedenborgian spirits, one does best to choose children's eyes for the purpose.")

The following are fragmentary examples from Goethe's works:

Werther (19, 9): "Ich weiss nicht ob so täuschende Geister um diese Gegend schweben . . . und wie um die Brunnen und Quellen wohlthätige Geister schweben . . ." (9, 23): "ich sehe sie durch die Augen ihres Liebhabers." (9, 133): "Lippen, auf denen die Geister des Himmels schweben . . ."

("I do not know whether such illusive spirits hover about this region . . . and how beneficent spirits hover over the wells and springs." "I see her through the eyes of her lover." "Lips upon which the spirits of Heaven play.")

Mahomet (39, 190):
Mahomet: Wie dank ich ihm, er hat meine Brust geöffnet, . . . dass ich sein Nahen empfinden kann.
Halima: Du träumst! Könnte deine Brust erffnet worden sein, und du leben?
Mahomet: Ich will für dich zu meinem Herrn flehen, dass du mich verstehen lernst.

(*Mahomet.* How I thank him, he has opened my bosom,—so that I can perceive his approach.
Halima. Thou dreamest! Could thy breast be opened, and thou live?
Mahomet. I will supplicate my Lord for thee, that thou mayest learn to understand me.)

Stella (11, 189):
Bist du ein böser Geist, in Gestalt meines Weibes?

(Art thou an evil spirit in the form of my wife?)

There are also a number of suggestive passages[18] in "Wilhelm Meister" (Carlyle's translation). We have in Vol. I, page 454, a striking description of the immortality of the soul, which is a good representation of Swedenborg's theory of the relation of the soul to the body:

It was as if my soul were thinking separately from the body; she looked upon the body as a foreign substance, as we look upon a garment. She pictured with extreme vivacity events and times long past, and felt by means of this, events that were to follow. Those times are all gone by, what follows is likewise to go by, the body will fall to pieces like a vesture, but I, the well-known I, I am.

[18] I owe this reference to Nugent. (See bibliography.)

Turning to scientific writings, we remember that Schlieper in his doctor's thesis points out not only the resemblance between Goethe's "Fragment on the Cranium" and Swedenborg's "Economy of the Animal Kingdom," but also traces a most striking parallelism running through chapters of "The Worship and Love of God." The theme is that of the birth and growth of the human mind in a pure world in which reigns a perfect unity and harmony between spiritual forces and intelligences, and the phenomena of nature.

The few instances cited above are sufficient to prove that Goethe recognized the extraordinary importance which the study of the hidden forces of nature has for the development of humanity. We need not be astonished to find him to be a mystic and an occultist who believes in powers hidden in man which we cannot fully understand and explain. We can find evidence [19] to show that Goethe believed in telepathy, that "a soul is able to impress another soul by the thought alone." He believed in spectres or astral bodies, and at times saw his friends in this guise. In the "Italian Journey" is recounted the story of Saint Filippo Neri:

> He had the natural gift of having a presentiment of things happening in distant places[20]; of knowing the thoughts of people; of transmitting his own thoughts unto others.

I am now prepared to take up the last phase of this investigation, and I turn to "Faust," the study of which first suggested to me that there might be a definite connection between the work of Swedenborg and that of Goethe.

It is a strange thing that Swedenborg's influence in Faust should not have been pointed out long ago. Up to comparatively recent times [21] there is no acknowledgment of this influence among Faust commentators. Early references are found in Schroer's "Commentary" (1881). He

[19] See *Current Literature*, July, 1906, pp. 84, 85: "Goethe as a Mystic."

[20] Like Swedenborg and the Stockholm fire.

[21] On the authority of Goerwitz. (See bibliography.)

recognizes Swedenborg in four passages, and remarks that "the dreamer was not unknown to Goethe." In Loeper (1879) we find a good many references to Swedenborg, especially in the second part of "Faust." Erich Schmidt [22] is the first modern authority to lay great stress on the fact that the spirit appearances and language of the first monologue are inspired by Swedenborg. He calls attention to the then unpublished article by Morris which, as far as enumeration of a great number of passages is concerned, is the best article that we have on Swedenborg in Faust. Calvin Thomas, as we shall see, does not definitely recognize Swedenborg's influence at all in Part I; in Part II he mentions Swedenborg in one very obvious connection.

In interpreting a few chosen passages from "Faust" in Swedenborgian fashion, it will be necessary for me to follow Morris very closely. We must give him credit for gathering together in one article the greatest number of references. Some of his comments are very good, but it is evident that he made his study purely from interest in Faust, and not from any interest in Swedenborg. Indeed, he seems to begrudge him any credit, and affects toward him the supercilious tone of Kant. To offset Morris's indifference we fortunately can avail ourselves of the enthusiastic comments of Goerwitz, who is primarily interested in Swedenborg. Morris draws his references to Swedenborg exclusively from the "Arcana," and quotes entirely from the original Latin. The reader is given very little aid in drawing his own analogies between the Latin and the German Faust passages in question. Goerwitz, with his greater knowledge of Swedenborg, is able to refer to more of his works and at the same time to give a more lucid interpretation, although he, too, uses Morris's article as a working basis.

Swedenborg is the magic to which Faust turns in his dissatisfaction with earthly knowledge. It is Swedenborg

[22] Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt: Einleitung, pages 23 and 39.

who can teach him "was die Welt im Innersten zusammenhält" (what the world inmostly contains).

419. Und dies geheimnissvolle Buch,
Von Nostradamus eigner Hand
Ist dir es nicht Geleit genug?

(And this mysterious book,
From Nostradamus' own hand,
Is it not a sufficient guide for you?)

Nostradamus is a "Deckname" (pseudonym), as Morris expressively puts it. The book is really the "Arcana Cœlestia," and the expression "Geheimnissvolle Buch" (book full of secrets) contains a pun on this title. Nostradamus wrote nothing more important than a book of prophecies and an almanac. This monologue was written in 1773. Swedenborg had just died in 1772, and could not be mentioned in a scene supposed to have taken place in the 16th century.

The next lines permit us to assume that Faust is holding the "Arcana" in his hand. There is no question here of astronomical science, as might be expected, but the planet's course is the interrelation of terrestrial bodies as described in the "Arcana" and in Swedenborg's "Earths of the Universe."

424. Dann geht die Seelenkraft dir auf,
Wie spricht ein Geist zum andern Geist.

(Then flames up thy soul's power,
As when one spirit speaks to another.)

is a paraphrase of Swedenborg's statement:

By the Divine mercy of the Lord, my interiors, which are of my spirit, have been opened, and it has thus been granted to speak with those in the other life — not only with those from this earth, but also with those from other earths. (Arcana, n. 6695.)

Every line in this monologue is impregnated with Swedenborgian significance. Space forbids that we interpret [23] each line. Faust opens the book and his enraptured words testify to the tremendous impression received by Goethe when Fräulein von Klettenberg first made him acquainted

[23] See Morris and Goerwitz for this.

with Swedenborg's works at Frankfurt. It was impelled by this enthusiasm that he called Swedenborg the "honored seer of our times."

442. Jetzt erst erkenn' ich was der Weise spricht!
Die Geisterwelt ist nicht verschlossen;
Dein Sinn ist zu, dein Herz ist todt!
Auf, bade, Schüler, unverdrossen
Die ird'sche Brust im Morgenroth!"

(Now first perceive I what the sage relates!
"The world of spirits is not closed up;
Thy sense is dull, thy heart is dead!
Rise, scholar, bathe undismayed
Thy earthly breast in the morning-red!)

"Der Weise" (the sage) is now generally admitted to be Swedenborg, but what wild speculations the commentators have made before drawing this necessary conclusion! Bayard Taylor makes the brilliant discovery that these four lines, which Faust apparently quotes, are not from Nostradamus, and displays his ignorance by suggesting that they might possibly have been taken from Jacob Böhme's "Aurora," but that an actual quotation is not necessary. Calvin Thomas's note is equally stupid in alleging that Goethe was not thinking of any one in particular. It was Erich Schmidt (page 39 of his commentary) who first recognized "the sage" as Swedenborg. Morris used this as a clue in tracing out Swedenborgianism in the whole monologue. Indeed, these four lines are the key to all this influence in Faust as well as to the most important part of Swedenborg's theology.

Swedenborg teaches the existence of two worlds; the natural world and the spiritual world. The spiritual world is projected into this natural world and is alive within it as the soul is within the body. Matter, of which our world is composed, is dead, and only lives when impregnated with spirit. The spiritual world is now invisible to us. It becomes visible only at death. It is not a distant place removed by space, to which we have to make a long journey. It is with us and in us, and the spirits which inhabit it are all around us. We cannot see them and they cannot

see us, because spirit can only be seen with the eyes of the spirit and matter only with the natural eyes. They can see the things of our world only when permitted to look through the natural eyes of some mortal. The minute our spiritual eyes are opened, we shall see the spirits and their world. This privilege was granted to Swedenborg before death that he might instruct the rest of mankind as to the future life.

With this information, we are in a position to understand what is meant by the spirit world not being closed. It is we who are hindered by our natural bodies and gross eyes made to see only the things of this world until the veil of the flesh drops away. Goethe poetically imagines that Faust's spiritual senses are opened. He at once perceives the proximity of spirits, and later talks with one.

447. Wie alles sich zum Ganzen webt,
Eins in dem andern wirkt und lebt!

(How all entwines to form the whole,
One in the other works and lives!)

can easily be understood by my little formula from Swedenborg. It refers to the intertwining of the spirit-universe or macrocosm with the natural world or microcosm, the dual existence of spirit and matter.

Morris shows the manifestation connected with the spirit's appearance to be made up of elements taken from Swedenborg's descriptions of his own visions. The Erdgeist (Spirit of Earth) is essentially a Swedenborgian conception. "The whole of Heaven, viewed collectively, is in form as one man; so also in the Lord's view is the universal human race as one man" (Swedenborg's "Divine Love," VI). The Erdgeist, then, is a symbol for the whole human race, and he is sent to Faust because this spirit is most nearly congenial to him. The Erdgeist came unwillingly, however, and only in obedience to the following force exerted upon him:

483. Du hast mich mächtig angezogen,
An meiner Sphäre lang gesogen.

(Thou hast attracted me with powerful force,
Hast sucked long at my sphere.)

"Every spirit—still more, every society of spirits—has its own sphere from his accepted principles and persuasions." ("Arcana," 1510.)

"There are genii and spirits who induce upon the head a kind of suction or attraction." ("Arcana," 5180.)

In this case Goethe reversed the process and had Faust do the sucking. The Erdgeist does not stay long with Faust because they find each other uncongenial. He will send in his place an inferior spirit (Mephistopheles) who will please him better.

512. Du gleichst dem Geist den du begreifst,
Nicht mir!

(Thou art like the spirit thou understandest,
Not like me!)

Morris admits that it was Goethe's first intention to recast the Faust-myth in the spirit of Swedenborg (see Goerwitz, p. 237). Faust's compact would then appear as the conjunction of a man with the spirit-world. He turns first to the Spirit of the Earth. The latter rebuffs him, and sends him an inferior spirit, a bad spirit of earth. Goethe wanted to lead the traditional coarse ideas of deviltry (as perhaps in Marlowe's "Dr. Faustus") over into the nobler and more universal conceptions of Swedenborg's spirit-universe, and thus prepare for the Faust-theme a new basis. In other words, he wanted to Christianize the Faust-myth. Later, he reverted to the old, mediæval Mephistopheles, and the previous verses remain standing as a fragmentary monument to Swedenborgian influence.

There are no more traces of Swedenborgianism to be found in the later scenes of Faust I, except in connection with Gretchen. Goerwitz takes Morris to task for being reluctant to give Swedenborg credit.

Morris says:

> It is, perhaps, to many distasteful that Gretchen, too, is thus drawn into the circle of Swedenborg's conceptions; but such is the fact, and we may see here, again, with what energy Goethe endeavored to permeate his material with this element. (P. 502.)

Goerwitz says:

> Perhaps it has not occurred to Morris that Swedenborg's spirit-world had become so familiar to Goethe that it came natural to him to use its figures whenever he wanted to be most touching and impressive. (P. 238.)

The passages in question are those which have to do with Gretchen's perception of Mephisto's evil sphere. A number of such passages occur in the "Gartenszene" (pp. 166-172 of Thomas). For example:

> 3498. Auch wenn er[24] da ist, könnt' ich nimmer beten,
> Und das frisst mir in's Herz hinein.
>
> (Also when he is present, I can never pray,
> And that sends a shudder thro' my very heart.)

Especially do we find this element in the whisperings of the evil spirit of despair and melancholy in the "Domszene" (cathedral scene):

> *Gretchen.*
>
> 3794. Weh! Weh!
> Wär' ich der Gedanken los,
> Die mir herüber und hinüber gehen
> Wider mich!
>
> (Woe! Woe!
> Were I only free from the thoughts,
> Which overwhelm me,
> In spite of myself!)

Swedenborg says à propos of this situation:

> Genii do not operate upon, and flow into, the thoughts, but into the affections. These they perceive, and trace by scent, as hounds trace their game in the forest. When they perceive good affections to exist, they in a moment turn them into evil ones. . . . They do so clandestinely and with malignant art. (Heaven and Hell, n. 579.)
>
> Evil spirits are malignant and cunning, they insinuate themselves into man's very loves by flattering them, and thus lead the man in among themselves; and presently, when they have led him in, they attempt to destroy his loves, and so to kill the man. (Arcana, n. 1820.)

[24] Mephistopheles.

We have seen that the bulk of Swedenborgian elements are to be found in the "Urfaust" (the original Faust), the plan of which was conceived and written in the years 1772-1775 when Goethe was in close touch with the circle of Fräulein von Klettenberg and was subject to the first youthful enthusiasm which the influence of Swedenborg's writings early aroused in him. The Second Part of Faust was written in the last seven years of his life, and may be expected to contain the last results of Goethe's wisdom and life. We are not surprised, then, to find Goethe at the end of his life turning back to the Swedenborgian ideas which so deeply impressed him in his youth.

As Faust is dying, Mephistopheles makes ready to claim the soul. Hell opens, and devils gather around Faust. Instead of taking the dead man's soul away to a remote place, the devils bring hell with them "to have it handy" (Thomas's note). Beneath the hocus-pocus and sly humor of this situation we may note that it is in accordance with Swedenborg's theory of the proximity of the spirit-world. The mere approach of the angels who come strewing roses causes the devils (11,738) "stürzen ärschlings in die Hölle" (to tumble backwards into hell). Mephistopheles remains on the spot, but is made to feel exceedingly uncomfortable. His skin burns, and boils come out upon his body. It is evident that he finds himself entirely out of his element. According to Swedenborg:

> They who are in no faith, as is the case with those in hell . . . when they approach to an angelic society . . . begin to be suffocated, and to become as images of death; therefore, they cast themselves headlong into their hell. (Arcana, n. 9281.)

The angels aid Faust's soul to escape from the material body, and they carry it away with them in triumph, singing of the power of divine spheres.

The final scene of Faust II shows Faust's glorification and entrance into heaven. Goethe peoples his heaven with the figures of the Roman Catholic "Heiligenhimmel"

(Saints-heaven). These typical characters would be lifeless and inactive without the Swedenborgian element.

The Pater Seraphicus, a hermit dwelling in the middle region, addresses the Chorus of Blessed Boys in a beautiful way which suggests the love which, according to Swedenborg, the angels bear toward children who have died young. The celestial angels are the ones who have little infants in their charge. They inhabit the heavens of innocence, and it is also their mission to receive and welcome souls newly entering the spiritual world.

Pater Seraphicus.

11898. Knaben! Mitternachts Geborne,
Halb erschlossen Geist und Sinn,
Für die Eltern gleich Verlorne,
Für die Engel zum Gewinn.

(Boys! Born at midnight,
Spirits and senses half unfolded,
Lost at once for your parents,
Gained for the profit of the angels.)

These boys died so young that their senses had no opportunity to unfold and develop. For this reason, Pater Seraphicus takes them within himself ("nimmt sie in sich," 11910) that through his eyes they may familiarize themselves with the sights of the natural world.

11906. Steight herab in meinen Augen
Welt- und Erdgemäss Organ,
Könnt sie als die euern brauchen
Schaut euch diese Gegend an.

(Descend into my eyes,
Organs suitable to material substance,
You can use them as your own,
Gaze upon this region.)

This seeing through others' eyes seems to have attracted Goethe particularly, as we have already observed in some of his letters.

In this scene Goethe speaks of two classes of angels,—the younger and the more perfect angels. This is a well-known

distinction made by Swedenborg. It is the celestial, or more perfect, angels who watch by the dying. Goethe has them bearing the soul of Faust. Swedenborg says:

> When the celestial angels are with one who is raised again, they do not leave him, they love every one; but when his spirit is such that he can no longer be in company with celestial angels, he desires to depart from them. (Heaven and Hell, n. 450.)

These angels in Faust explain in their song (l. 11955) that there still remains in Faust some of the impurities of earth. He will need a further cleansing before reaching his final spiritual environment. This doctrine of vastation, or purification, after death is distinctly taught by Swedenborg.

Gretchen, an angel now, has obtained leave to instruct the soul of Faust. He has finally set his face toward the right, and pure, self-denying love shall lead him on through ever-ascending heights. Gretchen is told to rise to higher spheres, and Faust will follow of his own accord.

Mater gloriosa.

12095. Komm! hebe dich zu höhern Sphären,
Wenn er dich ahnet, folgt er nach.

(Come! raise thyself to higher spheres,
When he perceives thee, he will follow.)

The "Chorus mysticus" with which the majestic drama closes is very significant of Swedenborg's general system.

Chorus Mysticus.

12104. Alles Vergängliche
Ist nur ein Gleichniss;
Das Unzulängliche
Hier wird's Ereigniss;
Das Unbeschreibliche,
Hier ist's gethan;
Das Ewig-Weibliche
Zicht uns hinan.

(All things transitory
Are only symbols;
Things unattainable
Here become actualities;

The indescribable
Here is reality;
The eternal feminine
Draws us onward.)

The world exists only because of and through spiritual realities, and all things of this world are symbols or correspondences of the spiritual world, which is the only true reality.

Is this not a beautiful way in which Goethe describes the reception into the World of Spirits of Faust's soul immediately after the death of the body? There is no mention of any great and terrible last judgment, with opening graves and material bodies rising, as might have been made by Goethe writing in the spirit of mediæval Christianity unilluminated by the eschatology of Swedenborg. In spite of this, Morris (p. 510) suggests that the old Goethe employed these naïve Swedenborgian views for his last scene with a cynical smile upon his lips. That Goethe wrote this beautiful last scene merely for stage effect is inconceivable under the circumstances. Goethe was over eighty when he wrote these lines and close to the end of his earthly existence. This strong reappearance of Swedenborg at the very end of Goethe's work and life must be significant.[25] May it not indicate that Goethe at heart was a firm believer in the new Christian religion revealed by Swedenborg?

Since Goethe's death some of the greatest thinkers of the world have been influenced by Swedenborg, and many of them have paid splendid tributes to him. Carlyle speaks of him as:

> A man of great and indisputable cultivation, strong mathematical intellect, and the most pious, seraphic turn of mind, — a man beautiful, lovable, and tragical to me, with many thoughts in him, which, when I interpret them for myself, I find to belong to the high and perennial in human thought.

Coleridge wrote:

> I have often thought of writing a work to be entitled "Vindication of Great Men unjustly branded"; and at such times the

[25] Goerwitz has this opinion very strongly.

names prominent to my mind's eye have been Giordano Bruno, Jacob Böhme, Benedict Spinoza, and Emanuel Swedenborg. (Worcester's Life and Mission, p. 412.)

We also have the statements of a great American. Emerson says:

> The most remarkable step in the religious history of recent ages is that made by the genius of Swedenborg. . . . These truths, passing out of his system into general circulation, are now met with every day, qualifying the views and creeds of all churches, and of men of no church. (*Ibid.*, p. 416.)

Many other such tributes could be quoted. The statement of Balzac, that he "returned to Swedenborg after vast studies of all religions, and found his religion to be the only one a superior man can accept," is perhaps the most emphatic of all. Goethe was surely a man with a superior mind. He investigated everything without prejudice, and did not deny what he did not know. We know that Goethe knew of Swedenborg. The theology of the Great Seer could not fail to appeal to his universal mind, especially as he was not hindered by any orthodox or dogmatic beliefs. There has always been a great deal of doubt as to Goethe's religious convictions, and a good deal is said about his constructing an individual system for his own personal benefit. Swedenborg is probably the clue to Goethe's personal "credo."

The time has passed when students of Goethe could afford to dismiss references to the influence of Swedenborg with a flippant smile. They cannot help being impressed with what they read in passing. This thesis falls far short of covering all the evidence for Swedenborg's influence upon Goethe. A complete study of this subject can only be made by a German scholar who will make a careful search of the Goethe archives, not necessarily in order to find further evidences of Goethe's fame, but with the determination to give Swedenborg all the credit that he deserves. Almost countless biographies of Goethe and commentaries on "Faust" have been written in many languages, and it is not likely that their stream will diminish in the future, for

each generation will view in a new way, the great man and his immortal work. In closing, I wish to make the plea that future biographers [26] of Goethe make adequate mention of the great part Swedenborg's influence played in his life, and that future Faust commentators recognize and interpret correctly the passages pervaded with Swedenborgianism.

WALDO C. PEEBLES.

BIBLIOGRAPHY *

1. Bielschowsky: Life of Goethe.
2. The Encyclopædia Britannica.
3. Kuno Francke: The "Blessed Boys" in Faust and Klopstock. (*Modern Philology*, April, 1905, pp. 461–2.)
4. Emanuel F. Goerwitz: Swedenborg in Goethe's Faust. (*New-Church Review*, April, 1902, pp. 222–244.)
5. Goethe — Jahrbuch: Volumes III, VII, and XIV.
6. Goethe: Wahrheit und Dichtung, Volume 17, Cotta' sche Verlag, 1859.
7. Herder: Origin of Language. Pub. London, 1827.
8. Herder: Adrastea. Pub., 1802.
9. Hermann: Goethe as a Mystic. (*Current Literature*, July, 1906, pp. 84–5.)
10. Kant: Dreams of a Spirit-Seer. Translated by Emanuel F. Goerwitz, and edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by Dr. Frank Sewall.
11. Lewes: Life and Works of Goethe.
12. Max Morris: Swedenborg im Faust. (*Euphorion*, 1899, pp. 491–510.)
13. Charles R. Nugent: The Influence of Swedenborg upon Goethe. (*New-Church Review*, Oct., 1900, pp. 541–547.)
14. Hans Schlieper: Emanuel Swedenborg's System der Naturphilosophie. Doctor's thesis, Berlin, 1901.
15. Erich Schmidt: Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt. Weimar, 1899.

---

[26] The standard biographers, Bielschowsky and Lewes, do not mention Swedenborg's name a single time.

(*Works read or consulted in the preparation of this essay, arranged alphabetically according to authors.)

16. Swedenborg: Arcana Cœlestia.
17. Swedenborg: Heaven and Hell.
18. R. L. Tafel, A.M., Ph.D.: Documents concerning Swedenborg. 3 volumes.
19. Calvin Thomas: Goethe's Faust. 2 volumes. Heath & Co.
20. Benjamin Worcester: Life and Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg.

THE STORY OF THE PATRIARCHS. II.

(The Word as a Whole: Second Series, V. 2.)

By the Rev. Lewis F. Hite.

THE foregoing survey of "The Story of the Patriarch" (see the last preceding issue of this Review) brings to view a theory,—a theory both of the Word as a whole and of this story as a part of that whole. The theory begins with the assumption that the Bible is the Word of God, in that God's thought and will are expressed in it, and abide in it forever, in the forms of symbolic, representative, correspondential, words and ideas, specially chosen for the purpose by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit. The oneness of the Bible is due primarily to the oneness of the Divine nature and to the omnipresence of the Divine Love and Wisdom. So that God is actually and fully present in the whole and in every part of His Word, according to Swedenborg's dictum, "The Divine is the same in greatests and in leasts" (Divine Love and Wisdom, nn. 77-81), and in accordance with the fundamental principle of idealistic metaphysics, that reality is a systematic whole of experience. The constitution of such a whole was illustrated by that of a complete melody, where the whole melody is at once in each and all of the notes. This is the first step towards comprehending the Bible as a whole.

In the next place, it must be understood that, as Swedenborg says, "The whole Sacred Scripture is about the Lord" (Doctrine of the Lord, n. 2), and, in the deepest sense, "is about Him alone." This is another way of saying that in the highest and deepest sense "The Lord is the Word" (*ibid.*).

But, as is obvious, the Bible is also, at least in its letter, about men; and this introduces another set of problems,

other than those presented by the oneness of the Divine Life, and that of the Word as the unique expression of the Divine Life. For human life is not merely progressive; it is also fragmentary, and even at moments and intervals retrogressive; it seems to proceed by alternate advance and retreat, rise and fall. Consequently, the letter of the Bible as the story of human life is cut up into periods and episodes, into personal, tribal, and racial histories.

The problem presented by these conditions is that the Bible story as a whole must be made to fit human life as a whole. This implies that the parts of the Bible story fit the periods and stages of human life both in the individual and in the race. If, as we are saying, the Divine Life is fully and everywhere present in the Word, the Story of the Word must be complete; all the parts must be actually present also in their relative completeness. But these parts must then have a progressive order to fit the progressive periods and stages of human life. This requirement gives us at least two problems. We must consider how such relatively complete static wholes can be made to fit the imperfect and progressive states and stages of human life. And in the second place, we must make out as clearly and fully as possible the distinctiveness of the several stages of the Bible narrative, and the corresponding distinctiveness of the states and stages of the spiritual life represented. It is this latter point that especially concerned us in the foregoing discussion of the Story of the Patriarchs. We there indicated in brief the types of spiritual life represented by the stories of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. We there pointed out that the states represented by these stories, especially the stories of Abraham and Isaac, might be distinguished from those represented by the stories of Adam and Noah by the character of relatively greater abstractness which may be assigned to the latter. Or more explicitly, if we attempt to arrange the spiritual states and processes represented by the stories in serial order and in the order of spiritual development and progress, it may be shown that the story of Adam and of Eden represents the complete development of the spiritual affections under rela-

tively pure conditions, free from the burden of a sensuous and perverted heredity. This relatively pure affectional development Swedenborg calls celestial, in contrast with forms of development more or less complicated with intellectual and sensual conditions. The type of affectional development designated celestial may be perhaps characteristically exemplified in the early history of the race, in primitive peoples, and in infancy and childhood; supremely in the infancy and childhood of the Lord. But as there is more or less of this higher and purer affectional life in all men and in all stages of human development, and above all in the Lord's life throughout, the story of Adam and Eden may be said to represent universally the pure type of celestial development wherever found, whether in infancy, childhood, youth, or manhood; whether in Eden, or in the New Jerusalem, or in the Lord Himself.

Now we have to distinguish between this type of celestial development and that represented by the story of Abraham. While in the case of the earlier story, we take our clue from the quality of innocence and from the state of openness to the Lord, both of which suggest instinctive and spontaneous response to the Divine influences, in the case of the story of Abraham we seem to have the clue in the simple, unquestioning obedience which Abraham's life exemplifies. Here we might point out a difference of level as well as a difference of stage. Using this obvious clue, and reading the story as representative of the complete development of a certain type of the life of obedience, we must first get the story as a whole before us, and then proceed to interpret it as a whole and in detail.

The Story of Abraham tells of his journey from Ur of the Chaldees to the Holy Land, and his final settlement there. This simple fact makes it a whole, just as the journey from Egypt to Canaan makes the Story of the Exodus a whole. In both cases the symbolic significance as a whole is a common-place of Biblical interpretation. The stories have been taken by Christian readers from the beginning as symbolic descriptions of phases of the Christian life; but it must be said that the Story of the Exodus

has been the more workable symbol. The Story of Abraham has yielded heretofore little more than dramatic interest and simple lessons in obedience; the details have baffled definite spiritual interpretation. Our task is at present to follow with Swedenborg's help the clue of the symbols, and set forth in some detail the distinctive meaning of the Story in terms of Christian experience.

First the journey as a whole. It is obvious that the "Promised Land" here, as elsewhere, stands for heaven, the state of the regenerated life. The journey to the Land represents the progress of the regenerating life; the episodes and incidents represent states and stages. All this is obvious and easy.

Now let us try to take the next step, and define more exactly the states represented by the beginning, the stages, and the end of the Story. We look for a different meaning of Canaan here from what we would find in the Story of the Exodus; that is, a different state of the heavenly life would be represented. In the one Canaan is reached and possessed for the first time, in the other it is recovered. This suggests that the life represented is lost and then recovered, and therefore it is somehow different. In both obedience is involved; but in the one case it is obedience to the Divine Word spoken for each occasion, in the other it is obedience to a body of Divinely given laws. So the type of life has a different setting, a different constitution, and a different basis, in the two cases. Further details will follow the development of the story from the beginning.

The story of Abraham is significantly complicated with that of Isaac; and the story of Isaac is completely overlapped by the stories of Abraham and Jacob. This means that the spiritual states and processes represented by these stories are to a large extent in progress at the same time. Furthermore, it is significant that the story of Jacob covers almost completely that of Joseph, so that the story of the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, takes up the whole of Genesis from the eleventh chapter. The fact that this story ends in Egypt, while the story of the Exodus begins in Egypt and ends in Canaan, is an important clue to the

distinctiveness of the stories, and also to the general character of the spiritual life represented by the former. It suggests that Egypt represents some type of natural-mindedness as a point of departure in the one case and as a point of attainment in the other. Taking this clue we may think of Isaac as representing a transition stage from the Abraham state to the Jacob state. It would seem then that the story of the Patriarchs as a whole must represent some kind of spiritual descent from a higher to a lower level, and that the stories of the Patriarchs taken severally represent the three normal and universal stages of this descent. Our task is to trace the progress of these stages in detail.

There is one sense in which all spiritual progress is downwards, and another in which it is upwards. Every human being, it seems, is endowed originally with a most interior, very tender, instinctive, spontaneous feeling. This is exemplified in young children, and in parental and marriage love. It is stored up in childhood, and is brought to light and activity on various occasions in after life, especially perhaps in the many forms of the so-called conversion experience, which is sometimes called by eminence "Christian experience." This quality of affectional life Swedenborg designates in children especially *innocence,* and when stored up for future use he calls it *remains;* and in general it is this quality of affection at all stages and levels that is meant by his word *celestial;* the life of such affection he calls *celestial love,* the objects of this love he terms *celestial good,* and the light in which it sees its objects is *celestial truth.* This vocabulary is convenient if not necessary for the understanding of Swedenborg and for the interpretation of our story.

It is a matter of common observation that this type of life needs to be enlightened and to be developed in practical experience before it can be completely expressed without danger or loss. The innocence of childhood, what Swedenborg calls the *innocence of ignorance,* is proverbially unsafe, and must be enlightened and developed into the wise innocence of the old man, what, again, Swedenborg calls the *innocence of wisdom.*

Let us now follow out the obvious suggestion that Abraham stands for the pure, simple, exalted affection; Isaac for the intelligence which interprets and guides it; and Jacob for the practical life in which both must be embodied to be completely expressed.

With respect to the meaning of Abraham, we have besides his position in the stories and the quality of obedience so characteristic of his conduct, the circumstances of his call. It is at once evident that the life of simple obedience is the fitting and proper expression of the kind of affection we have been defining; but further we may see in the departure from Ur of the Chaldees and the sojourn at Haran the representative conditions under which the affection makes its appearance. Ur of the Chaldees was a land of idolatry, and Abram had a long line of idolatrous ancestors. Haran was an intermediate stage on the way to Canaan. "And Terah took Abram his son; and Lot the son of Haran. . . . And they went forth with them from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan." This movement on the part of Terah would seem to represent the quickening, or at least the existence, of a quality of capacity which could be made the basis of a new development of heavenly life; and we may look for this quality in the affectional remnant of spiritual life handed down through the ages of degeneration from Noah. Abram would then represent a distinct development of this quality; and "the call" would be the beginning of the development. We must avoid here, as throughout, the persistent and disastrous error of applying the representative meaning to the psychological or spiritual development of Abram himself. Abram and his history were purely representative, and to little or no extent the actual embodiment or exemplification of the spiritual meaning of the narrative. This caution is necessary to correct an inveterate habit. We return to the question, What is this quality which Abram represents? At the stage of simple idolatry, where interior religious ideas and affections are not perverted because they no longer exist, there is, or may be, a deeply hidden and really elevated affection of the quality above described, undeveloped, but pure and

innocent, inwardly disposed to respond to good impressions, and to instruction and guidance. This indeed seems to be the kind of idolatry out of which Abram actually emerged; for his father Terah and his brother Haran, idolaters, being dead, the idolatry of Abram may be taken as the last stage just before the quickening of the affection which is to be the basis of future spiritual development. Then the sojourn in Haran would represent the simple rudimentary knowledge and teaching which show the contrariety between the worship of external objects and obedience to the dictates of gentle, innocent, and loving affection; and the Call of Abram would mean the first obscure recognition of the quality of this affection and the first turning to it as the Divine presence within the soul. The whole story of Abram which follows is a symbolic account of the development of this affection from this initial state to the state which Swedenborg calls in the Lord the "Divine celestial." Swedenborg applies the symbols directly to the development of this affection in the Lord as the only complete fulfilment of the meaning; but in the course of his exposition he shows that it also applies to the same development in man in his regeneration, and to the race. The journey to Canaan and the various stages of the journey through Canaan represent accordingly the various stages of the development of the celestial quality of the affectional life universally, whether in the Lord or in man or in the race. The journeys through the land until the mountain east of Bethel was reached represent early and preliminary stages of instruction. The journeying thence towards the south means progress to interior light, but with inadequate knowledge of outward ways of expression. This latter is what is meant by "famine in the land." The journey to Egypt and the sojourn there represent progress and attainment of the knowledge. The curious episode of disguising Sarah and calling her his sister represents the law of order in spiritual development,—especially of the highest type of affectional life,—that knowledge must be sought and acquired for its own sake. This is the genuinely scientific motive; and it holds good for liberal education as well as

for spiritual development. It seems then that this Egypt stage corresponds to the whole period and process of scientific education, approximately and properly the period of youth. We have two other notable instances of descent into Egypt, that of Joseph and that of the Lord Himself. This shows that the knowledge acquired in and for the Abram development is not final; that it is not sufficient for other types and stages of affectional development. Furthermore it is not merely at the youth stage that a new supply of outward knowledge is needed; but whenever and wherever, in youth or manhood, the type of celestial development reaches the Egypt stage.

After the sojourn in Egypt, Abram returns to Canaan, and retraces his steps to the early stopping place, the mountain east of Bethel; afterwards he moves to Hebron. Then comes the war with Chedorlaomer. All this represents the process of re-establishing the affectional life on the basis of the newly acquired knowledge, and the ensuing conflict between this life and the scientific spirit engendered by the knowledge. The blessing of Melchizedek represents the state of peace following the victory, and also the fuller and freer development of the interior affection. The next step is the rationalization of the level of affectional life here represented.

The process of acquiring knowledge involves more or less effort to systematize the knowledge and make use of it to interpret one's experience and carry out one's purposes. At first this effort has to do with external, practical motives; such as those of the instinctive, hereditary, conventional life, where sensuous and selfish desires strive for expression. Here the principle of self-interest is the standard of judgment, the rule of choice, and the organizing energy. These particulars characterize the rational level of the processes; they are all in the domain of what may be called the natural reason, in contrast with the later more advanced type of reason developed under the principle of unselfish love. The development of this natural reason is represented by the story of Ishmael, and the later development by Isaac.

The type of processes represented by Ishmael were met with under the representation of Lot, and will re-appear in still another form under the representation of Esau. These varieties are several grades of the natural sensual life, corresponding to the developments represented by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

It is interesting and significant that the story of Ishmael is followed immediately, not by the story of Isaac, but by a return to Lot with his flight from Sodom, and by the recital of Abram's journey to Philistia. This is a further development of the Ishmael experience. In the process of rationalizing the external life under the principle that this life must be made serviceable to the qualities of interior affection (the principle which Abram represents), the principles of the selfish life assert themselves in opposition, and this in two forms: in the form of unregulated sense impulse, represented by Lot; and in the form of deliberate and self-justified sense-indulgence, the principle that sense-life is the only real life, and that the knowledge of sense-facts is the test of truth and reality. This principle when raised to the level of knowledge of religious fact, the content of religious faith, is represented by Abimelech, king of Philistia. The intellectual level attained here seems to be surprisingly high in view of Swedenborg's application to the Lord's boyhood, even late boyhood. Acquiring knowledge for its own sake, the pursuit of science for the sake of science, is a process which goes on, of course, from childhood to old age. It is true that in late childhood and early youth the mind is especially active and effective in storing the memory, while in more advanced youth the rational instinct and interest emerge into prominence; but the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is a characteristic of mental life throughout; it is not a property of any period of individual or racial growth, but a universal type of mental interest and activity, which persists through all periods of growth.

Whenever and wherever this process of acquiring knowledge for its own sake goes on, there is the inevitable development of the spirit of confidence in external fact, and

on the highest level in the facts of religious history and of religious faith. This leads to two kinds of perversion: the use and denial of the facts in behalf of sensual indulgence; and their use for mere intellectual satisfaction. In either case there is opposition to the principle that all facts, especially religious facts, must be used in the service of pure, innocent, interior affection. The ensuing conflict and the establishment of the principle is represented by the Lot-Sodom episode and by Abram's sojourn in Philistia. The result of the conflict is the elimination of the evils of sense-life, and the subordination of the powers of the sense-mind to "celestial love" and its affections.

Hereupon arises a need for higher and more interior intelligence. The kind and grade of intelligence developed by knowledge of external facts under the principle, "knowledge for its own sake," is adequate to the task of ordering the sense-life and the contents of a perverted religious faith; but a higher and more interior intelligence is needed to interpret the full nature and qualities of the affection that was seeking expression in the lower mind and life. In other words "natural" reason and intelligence must give place to "spiritual" reason and intelligence. The growth, development, and quality of this latter is represented by the story of Isaac. It is obvious that the quality of intelligence represented by Isaac must have a share in the processes by which all the powers of the natural reason are illuminated and subordinated; and this is indicated in the story by the fact that the birth of Isaac was predicted not long after Ishmael was born, and the prediction was fulfilled while Abraham was in Philistia. When Isaac was weaned, Hagar and her son were driven into the desert; then came the sacrifice of Isaac, and after that the death of Sarah and the story of Rebekah. This brings the narrative up to the death of Abraham, when Ishmael and Isaac together bury him. Thus the story of Isaac goes along with that of Ishmael, representing the gradually increasing power of the higher intelligence.

Returning now to the story of Abraham, we have seen that the sojourn in Philistia represents highly complicated

processes of mental and spiritual development sufficient to secure the ascendency of the spiritual over the natural, and reaching a level of insight and comprehension characteristic of advanced stages of regeneration. Attention is called to this for the reason that Swedenborg applies the story of Abraham to the Lord's childhood and boyhood; and it seems incredible that such highly organized mental and spiritual life should belong to this period of growth. It is true that Swedenborg suggests that in the case of the Lord the processes were more rapid and complete than is possible with men. But even so, the story must also apply to the regeneration of men, and it is certain that no such elaborate and highly developed spiritual processes go on in the ordinary childhood and boyhood, or even in the mature life, of most men. We are therefore thrown back on our principle that the application is not made directly to persons or periods of growth at all, but to the development of a very well defined affection, namely what Swedenborg calls "celestial love." The qualities of this are no doubt best, or at least conveniently, described in terms of the affectional life of infancy and childhood; but it is a matter of common spiritual experience that these qualities of affection persist all through the development of man from infancy to old age; in fact there is a distinct and characteristic development of it in old age. The same would apply to race development, or to the development of the universal Church.

These observations are all the more pertinent when we come to the later features of the story of Abraham. Here we have the birth and sacrifice of Isaac, the death of Sarah, the story of Rebekah, and the death of Abraham.

In the process of regeneration, there must be a transition from the state of intelligence based upon knowledge for its own sake to the intelligence which uses that knowledge as a means of expressing the affections of celestial love, and which interprets the qualities of the affections to be expressed. These contrasted forms of intelligence are represented in general by the stories of Ishmael and Isaac. In the first place there must be a clear distinction made

between these two kinds of intelligence, and they must be separated from each other. This is represented by the weaning of Isaac, and the sending of Ishmael with his mother into the wilderness. This involves purifying the spiritual intelligence from the merely scientific spirit and from hereditary motives, represented by the circumcision of Isaac. In the course of this purification and separation, however, a suitable doctrinal basis must be established for the expression and interpretation of the affection-life of the grade and quality now active. This is represented by the covenant at Beer-sheba. This gives rise to an exceedingly perplexing situation. In the first place the doctrine must be truly descriptive and expressive of the qualities of the affection; and in the second place it must be expressed in terms of the knowledge so far acquired,— that is, in terms of memory knowledge and actual concrete experience. This means that there must be absolute self-surrender to the intuitions and requirements of celestial love, the genuine affection for unselfish life. The temptation is to take the point of view of rational interest and significance as opposed to the point of view of the quality of the interior affection. The struggle to overcome this tendency and to devote the rational powers wholly to the affectional point of view, and to take up the inner light of the affection into the rational insight,—all this is represented by Abraham's willingness and efforts to sacrifice Isaac. It would seem that this is one of the crucial situations of Christian experience, and the extreme test of the genuineness of the Christian purpose. In fact it seems to be one phase, if not the acute phase, of the present struggle between modernism and the instinctive affectional life of the Christian masses; possibly also a struggle within modernism itself between intellectual and scientific pride and the affectional religious instinct. At any rate, in the individual, the struggle must come at its bitterest when intellectual and scientific pride have had advanced development, and when the inner light of affection is sharply questioned. The act of self-surrender is then most trying. One of the most delicate tasks and severest tests of our rational powers is

to discriminate and adopt among the impulses and emotions that stream with bewildering confusion into the mind, those affectional qualities which our highest and deepest intuitions would approve. Abraham represents precisely these affectional qualities; and the sacrifice of the ram instead of Isaac represents the process of disentangling the rational powers from purely intellectual and scientific motives before they can be wholly devoted to the insights and interests of celestial love, which would be represented by the actual sacrifice of Isaac.

Furthermore, before there can be a complete union between the inner affection and the rational mind, that is, before the rational mind is perfectly fitted to embody and express the affection, there must develop an entirely new rational motive. It is not sufficient to discriminate, separate, and reject opposing points of view, but the affectional life must establish in the rational faculty itself a quality which will serve as the basis for the new motive. This is represented in general by the story of Rebekah and her marriage with Isaac. In the meantime, a new motive for seeking the truth, and a new kind of delight in the truth, must supervene. Hitherto, the quality of affection in process of development has been interior and spontaneous rather than reflective, and the kind of truth needed to interpret and guide it has been characteristically intuitive and instinctive; but with the development of the rational mind on the basis of scientific and doctrinal knowledge, this type of truth and the affection for it become more and more inadequate to deal with the new and highly complicated situations which arise. The transition here involved is represented in general by the death of Sarah and the establishment of Rebekah in Sarah's tent.

When the rational mind fully interprets the qualities, and accepts and adopts as its own the motives, of the inner affection, the union of the two is complete; and then the rational contains the affectional as its essential life. This is represented by the death of Abraham, and by the circumstance that his sons Ishmael and Isaac bury him.

This, in brief outline, is the spiritual meaning of the

story of Abraham applied in the concrete to the specific affection which Abraham represents. This affection in the case of the Lord was the inmost essence of His human life; and the development of this affection in the lower planes of His life, that is, in the rational and practical planes, is represented by the story of the three patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. With the death of Abraham, the representation of the Lord, for the reason given above, is carried on by Isaac alone.

The story of Isaac, after the death of his father, is immediately complicated with that of Jacob. Aside from this complication there remains only Isaac's sojourn in Philistia. We are reminded here of the corresponding episode in the life of Abraham. Abimelech re-appears; Rebekah, as was Sarah, is called sister; the same wells play an important part in the story. In both cases, it was famine that compelled the journey; and in both cases famine represents lack of knowledge,—in the case of Abraham memory knowledge, and in case of Isaac rational knowledge. The birth of Esau and Jacob intervenes between the death of Abraham and Isaac's sojourn in Philistia.

We have seen that the marriage of Isaac and Rebekah represents the union of the celestial qualities and motives of the now elevated rational mind with the affections for the truth needed in the further development of the rational mind as a fit instrument of the indwelling celestial love. This further development, however, involves the re-ordering and the re-endowment of the whole body of the sense-life. The principles of this transformation are represented by Esau and Jacob. But before this process can be fully and completely carried out, the rational mind itself must acquire new powers of insight and the command of higher orders of truth. This higher order of insight and truth is attainable only through an intimate acquaintance with the fallacies and false appearances both of memory knowledge of all grades and of the natural understanding of the meaning of this knowledge for life. After the experience of becoming acquainted with and mastering appearances, both of sense and of natural reason, represented by the

sojourn in Philistia, the rational powers are completely fitted to transmit the light and the life of celestial love to the sense-mind and its practical operations. This transmission is represented by Isaac's blessing of Esau and Jacob, especially Jacob. In the meantime it is necessary for the functions of the natural mind and life to undergo very thorough preparation for receiving and expressing the affections and the light of the spiritually developed rational mind. The good natural impulses, emotions, and affections, when developed and enlightened, become responsive to the interior affections; and the truth by means of which this enlightenment comes must be natural truth illumined by the higher rational light. A very elaborate account of this development is represented by the stories of Esau and Jacob. Although the quality of natural good affection must underlie the processes, the truth needed to interpret the affection must lead the way. This explains why Jacob supplanted Esau on every occasion; and it explains why Jacob finally represents the Lord and the completely embodied life of regenerated affection and thought.

In this brief survey of the Story of the Patriarchs, it appears that we have here a complete development of affectional, rational, and sensual life; and the successive embodiment of the affectional in the rational, and of the affectional and rational in the natural or sensual. We seem to have to do with all levels of these several kinds of life. The connection between this series of developments and that represented by the stories of Adam and Noah was touched upon in the former paper; it remains to make a suggestion as to the connection between the Story of the Patriarchs and that of the Exodus. It is surprising and puzzling that from the height of spiritual development represented by Joseph there should again be a descent into Egypt, followed by an apparently low beginning of another development to reach its culmination in the representation of Solomon. The point seems to be, that the whole Abraham-Isaac-Jacob development is from beginning to end an essentially affectional development; and that when this is completed, there must be another type of development,

namely, one on the basis of systematic knowledge and recognized law. The connecting link between these two types of development is Joseph, whose story therefore should have separate treatment.

LEWIS F. HITE.

THE SOLIDARITY OF HUMANITY; OR, THE *MAXIMUS HOMO* AND MODERN DEMOCRACY.

By the Rev. Walter B. Murray.

I AM going to imagine that I have in my hand a stone. As you look at it you say with me that it is round and hard. I look at it more closely and find that it is, let us say, gray in color, and made up of particles which all look very much alike. We all say that in character it is a solid body as differentiated from a liquid or a gas. It does not actually represent likeness in the particles that go to make it up any more than the liquid or the gas; but we seem to see the particles of a similar character a little more clearly.

Now you might not think that this was a very good object with which to symbolize the human race; nor indeed is it, and yet it appears to give us an idea of the likeness of individuals which go as units or atoms to form our race; and we are learning to speak in these modern days of the solidarity of the human race, as if the atoms or units that go to form the race were one in kind, and cohere together as the different particles in a solid cohere to form it.

This is a big idea, and with most people it is comparatively new; so new indeed that many have never thought about it at all. They who have caught a glimpse of the bigness and the possibilities that lie in the idea are apt to swell up with pride as they congratulate themselves upon having seen it, somewhat as the boy does who looks for the first time through a telescope, and sees the mountains on the moon, or the satellites of Jupiter. He feels a little sorry for other boys who have never seen such a wonderful view, and also a little superior.

This idea of the solidarity of the human race is big, and we shall hear more and more of it as we progress in this

New Age towards the beautiful ideal of brotherhood. Of course, we shall not think of humanity as a great gray stone, cold and hard; but nevertheless we shall recognize more clearly the inherent likeness in the particles or individuals that go to make up humanity. And I am persuaded that the views which now prevail in the world upon this subject, that seems so great to many, are very limited in comparison with the splendid fact which Swedenborg revealed when he was permitted under the Divine Providence to gain a comprehensive view of the spiritual universe. It is veritably the biggest and most satisfactory idea of the unity and solidarity of the human race that ever dawned on human vision.

Of course, this idea did not originate with Swedenborg any more than a great snow-clad mountain or range of mountains originates with the beholder. It is no more Swedenborg's idea than America is the idea of Columbus; yet Swedenborg was the Columbus who under the Lord's guidance revealed the nature and character of the spiritual universe, and brought to us these big ideas of what he heard and saw in superior realms. The supreme conception of human society made known to the world through the instrumentality of Swedenborg is God's idea; and it is big enough to be worthy of God.

Now this biggest idea ever presented to the mind of man in terms which are mentally conceivable, is the idea that all the human beings who have ever lived in the universe,—and the universe is a big place, and creation has existed no doubt for many millenniums,—are gathered together into one gigantic man, or *maximus homo,* and arranged according to their qualities and uses into the various parts of a human being; that this gigantic man fills the universal heaven; and that the soul of this immeasurable body is the Lord.

This is not the idea of solidarity which a stone gives us, however great, nor of any other solid of which we might think. It is the unity of universal humanity in a vast organism which shadows forth the life of God as the body expresses the soul. Every particle in it is not precisely like

every other particle, but differs through all the range of variety that is exhibited in the particles that go to make up the human body. In all the universe there is nothing that is absolutely like anything else. No two leaves on the same tree are precisely alike; so no two human beings that go to make any part of universal humanity are exactly the same. Variety in unity is God's law.

Let us study this vast conception of unified humanity a little more in detail. We find first of all that the constituent parts of this vast figure which fills the heaven in human form come from all the earths of the universe.

Now many people do not know whether there are any other inhabited worlds; but Swedenborg tells us a great deal about the other earths of the universe. If the universe of human beings were no greater than the total of those who have been born on this earth, it would not seem to be great enough for God. And what possible reason would there be for the other worlds in space except to propagate human life. If the God who makes this little globe of ours so wonderful in every detail, every flower or human being such a miracle, possesses the power to do so much, why could He not go further and create limitless worlds? If He can create ours, He can create a universe of them.

The thought that each star which we see in space is a sun surrounded by wheeling worlds like our own and others in our solar system, and that these multitudinous earths are peopled with human beings, is a concept of the universe worthy of the Divine, and that these are allotted a place in the Grand Man according to the quality of their good, is seen to be perfectly in harmony with the laws and operation of the Divine witnessed in the microcosm, man. The food of which we partake, coming from many sources, finds its place in our bodies according to its quality and usefulness, building up bone and muscle and nerve and other tissue; so in the Grand Man of the universe the individual units coming from every world go to their own appropriate places in the life and use of that highest limited manifestation of God. Each has his place in the Grand Man, not according to his person, but according to his uses.

Different earths constitute different provinces of the Grand Man.

In this vast and splendid view of the spiritual world we find the heavens divided into two kingdoms, the celestial and the spiritual. In the celestial kingdom are gathered all those superior souls of the human race who by the quality of their love to the Lord are nearest to Him and most receptive of His life. Their superior wisdom is merely the perception that flows from their superior quality of love; and we know that love gives surer knowledge than the intellect.

In the spiritual kingdom we find those in whom the intellectual predominates, principled it is true in love, but in a lower type of love, love which is intellectual rather than instinctive.

The celestial kingdom is peopled as it were by the children of the sun; for to them the Lord is as a sun in the heavens, whose heat and light they receive in a directer way. The spiritual kingdom is peopled as it were by the children of the moon; for to them the Lord is as the moon whose light is colder and more intellectual. And yet even they live in a light sparkling with a radiance so overwhelming that no idea of light on earth can enable us fully to realize its brightness, and in a happiness superior to every idea of joy that mortals on earth can ever here perceive.

The celestial kingdom forms the superior part of this gigantic figure of the heavens, the head and higher uses of human life. The spiritual kingdom forms the breast and middle region.

From the celestial and spiritual kingdoms there exists a third or lower heaven, technically called the first heaven, since it is first perceived in our upward ascent. This heaven is made up of those who have either the celestial or spiritual characteristics, but in a more natural or external way; and this more external heaven forms the loins and feet of the Grand Man; likewise in this part of the Grand Man the church on earth has as to its inner nature a part. For the Grand Man of the heavens must rest on the natural, and have its feet planted in the externals of God's uni-

verse. Indeed the natural universe is the stage on which is enacted the life of the spiritual universe.

Thus we have placed before our minds the colossal idea of the Grand Man. Is it not the biggest idea that was ever presented to men in a way to be mentally grasped? And when you realize that the Lord Himself, as we have indicated, is the soul and life of this whole man, you realize a universe proceeding from God which is at the same time His own outward body. And it is spiritually in the form of a man because God Himself is the only man; and it is thus God's own image in created things.

Because it is God's outward manifestation, God's life flows outwardly into man's form through perfectly adapted channels, making man in the individual as well as in the highest aggregate an image and likeness of God, God projected and reflected in all created things. Therefore it is that all created things in the complex as well as the individual man are in the man form, because they are adumbrations or shadowings-forth of the Divine Man. Therefore it was that God in manifesting Himself to the world took the form of a man, and glorified that form, making it infinite and eternal in its capacity for manifesting Himself on even the lowest planes of life.

Now God would not have us worship the Grand Man, or *Maximus Homo,* of heaven as Himself. We may look upon it in a sense as the body of God, and yet God as expressed in His creation, differentiated from Himself, not only in thought, but in fact. He would have us look upon Himself and worship Him as presented in Jesus Christ, for in the glorified Humanity He dwells in His own things, in His own Divine Human, separate from us.

But let us get another view of this collective humanity, for it is going to be, as we shall soon perceive, one of the most important ideas in all the world. Not only are we to look upon universal humanity as one Greatest Man, but likewise upon smaller groups of men in heaven and on earth as in the human form. The Lord's church on earth, which signifies (when it relates to men rather than principles) all those in whom the Lord has more or less estab-

lished the rule of the Divine, and which forms, as we before indicated, a part of the loins and the feet of the universal Grand Man, considered by itself is in the form of a man in God's sight. Let us keep in mind that the church on earth is not thought of as an ecclesiasticism, but as the kingdom or rule of God on earth. Of this smaller collective man we are told that the Lord's New Church, or the Lord's more perfectly revealed truth received and lived out by men, forms the heart and lungs; but all those in every religion who in any way acknowledge God and live according to the precepts of religion, have a part, those in the most light and living superior lives having the nobler uses of the body.

In all these concepts of collective man, whether the Grand Man or the church on earth, or even smaller groups, let us not think of the man *form* as identical with the man *shape;* yet they do exist and function after the spiritual likeness of a man. We need to get away from the sensuous thoughts of time and space. It is a little difficult for us to grasp this distinction between form and shape, so that when we speak of the form of a man we do not at once think also of the shape of a man. Possibly we would have a truer view of it, if we should think of the relationship which exists between the various parts of a man and the uses which they perform separately and collectively.

Thus, when we think of a nation, which is in the sight of God as one collective man, we need not think of the man shape, but the uses in the man operating together as one organic whole. This idea of society does not have the limitations of the idea of solidarity as seen in a great mass of stone composed of similar atoms, but of the variation and perfection in unity of the human body, our highest ideal of organized life, a unity of uses rather than persons separate from uses.

Likewise all in one province or state, and all in one community and all in one household, appear as one man. Therefore it is that a man is called the head of a family, and a ruler the head of the state.

Thus, in human life in the ascending scale the smallest unit is the individual man, the microcosm. The next larger

unit would be the family or household. The next larger man would be the community or the city. The next the state; the next the nation; the next the complex of all nations. Possibly this complex of all nations, or the international group, from the external point of view, because of its numerical superiority, would seem to be superior to that collective group which we before called the church on earth, or the rule of the Divine among human beings; but it is not so in importance, for a reason which we shall now disclose.

The principle which joins together the various units in a human body, or in the larger collective human group, is adaptability and conformation to the uses of the whole. We can imagine particles of food which enter the human body that cannot be utilized because of this lack of adaptability to the common good. In a household an unruly member is not an integral part if he persists in his unruliness; his unruliness, or lack of adaptabliity to the body, in a way outlaws him from it. Likewise in the community, the state, the nation, the units which do not unite with other units to constitute the larger group in a way to blend their life and use with the life and use of the larger group, outlaw themselves from it. The same is true of the international group. While it may be numerically larger as to individual units than the church or kingdom of God on earth, yet it is only as large in a coherent collective form as the aggregate of its units which obey Divine and human laws from the heart. Those in every group small or large who are unruly, disobedient, not governed by those laws of man which are in harmony with the laws of God, are outlaws, outcasts, rejected because of and by their own persistent disorderly qualities. In the largest group of all, the Grand Man, they are those who form the hells, the outcast unruly ones, the socially useless, the selfishly unfit for human co-operation and companionship.

As individuals our first allegiance in point of time and place is to the household; but we all recognize a certain form of obligation to the community, or state, or nation, which is higher than the duty to our own household, as in

case of war or other supreme necessity. The instinct that impels us to this sacrifice we call patriotism, and it is found to be universal among human beings. It is evidently a Divinely planted instinct, and entirely in keeping with the obligation to the greater neighbor. If I have by the commandment of God the duty imposed upon me to be kind to the individual neighbor, I have a far larger obligation to serve the larger group of neighbors constituting the community, the state, the nation. And guided by the same Divinely planted instinct of patriotism and Divinely taught obligation to love the neighbor as myself, I have a larger obligation to humanity in the complex of all nations.

Almost insensibly we have become aware of the entering in of a new principle; it is the recognition of the superiority of Divine ideals for men, and a consequent effort towards union because of this new likeness. We may from selfish motives love our own household, our own community, our own state, our own nation; but when we come to think of collective humanity in the complex of all nations, we find our motive chiefly an unselfish one. It is the love of that which is good for all men. It recognizes the rights of others in a new way. It perceives that if we would be happy, all others must be granted the opportunity to become happy. It brings into clear light the essential solidarity of the race, their oneness in the sight of God as His children, dowered with all the heritages of time and brotherhood.

When we get this new view of humanity, we glow with the thought of the perfection and happiness of the universal human race in the Greatest Man of heaven and earth; and we bow in love and adoration before Him who is the creator, the preserver, the life of all, the soul of the universe, revealed to us as our Heavenly Father.

Now just here we have had the introduction of the principle of democracy into human life. It is only when men get a big enough vision of the so-called solidarity of the human race, and of the rights of all other men to the heritages of our Heavenly Father to His children, that we become for the first time true democrats. The democratic

view is the world view of the human race, the view that admits into men's minds the idea of a universal brotherhood.

This development of the so-called Doctrine of the Grand Man leads us now to the consideration of the growth of democracy in our own era of the world.

The spirit of democracy has tried to manifest itself at many times and on many occasions throughout human history. By the spirit of democracy I mean the attempt of the people to govern themselves in recognition of the rights of all others. But due to the undeveloped condition of the human units that constituted the state in past times, every attempt at popular self-government was in vain. Every one perceived that a benevolent monarchy in a relatively undeveloped community was infinitely better for the people as a whole than a government by the ignorant and self-uncontrolled. But monarchies have not always been benevolent; in fact, few kings have been worthy to rule at all. Unlimited power in the hands of a human being is very much like dynamite in the hands of a child; it is apt to be misused, and to become dangerous to all others concerned. Kings have too often ruled as if no more than capricious and spoiled children; and the world has learned the sad and painful lesson, through centuries of suffering, that no government based upon the control of the many by one man or any group of men is a happy thing for the mass of men.

Not only should all governments depend for their just rights upon the consent of the governed, but upon the intelligent united and continuous action of the governed themselves in their collective capacity. No man nor set of men can be entrusted with anything beyond the most limited and temporary authority in the government of others.

It is a remarkable coincidence that the great new idea of the solidarity of the human race, which I have tried to outline in the Doctrine of the Grand Man, and yet have only dimly shown, as those familiar with Swedenborg will know, came into the world at the same time that the new

spirit of democracy, or self-rule by the people, came into successful operation. We of the New Church point to the fact with great frequency that in the Lord's charter to the New Church contained in the Book of Revelation, we find towards its end this statement from the Lord on the throne, —"Behold, I make all things new." And we call attention also to the fact that this new era in human affairs which all men acknowledge began to manifest itself immediately following the Last Judgment told of in the New Testament, and effected in the world of spirits in 1757. Swedenborg told of this Last Judgment in all its details with such circumstantial precision that it is incredible that it could have been invented by him or any man. And when we perceive the momentous results that have followed in human history in the liberation of the race from tyranny and oppression of every kind, we have the confirmation of it in outward historic fact.

Now Swedenborg not only brought to light the great truth of the race's solidarity, and the nature and character of the Last Judgment, but he said that the dominating characteristics of this New Age upon which man had entered were two; namely, Liberty and Rationality. In other words, he showed most clearly and satisfactorily that the Lord had come again, to do fully in His Second Coming that which He could not perfectly do at His First Coming; namely, to set men free. "I have come that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly." The First Coming was but a beginning; and this is demonstrated by the fact that He foresaw the necessity of a Second Coming. The Lord does not do things by halves, except as He is limited by the capacity of men to receive Him and to work out His programs. He was limited by the state of the human race at the time of His First Coming; and yet He had to come then, or else see the race perish by reason of its evils. But coming then He laid the basis for His Second Coming and eventual complete redemption of the human race, even on this earth.

I say "even on this earth," because it has long been thought by His followers that it would never be possible

for the Lord to effect the redemption of man in this world; thus, that He would have to give up the task and end man's struggle on this earth, bringing to pass only in the next life the glorious promises of the Messianic kingdom. No, the Lord does not do things by halves, even though He may be compelled by men to do only one thing at a time. Because of His First Coming He established Himself in His Divine Humanity on the plane of nature, from which He could work until He could manifest Himself in a fuller and completer way. In His Second Coming He has actually begun to reign; and throughout the corporate body of humanity in heaven and on earth there is perceived the renovating effects of a new life from God, sloughing off the old evils and renewing the universal man made in God's image and likeness. Even the dullest of men have begun to see the effects of this powerful influx of life from God, although they have not known just how and why it was able to express itself in a new way.

There is a reason for everything, a cause for every effect; and the cause of our new era is the Lord's Second Coming. It alone can account for the effects. Those who have their eyes opened to perceive the causes of the effects in the natural world which we see on every hand have no doubts whatsoever as to the progressive increase of democratic principles. We were not blinded by a great world-war; nor did we fear that the hellish principle of autocracy would be successful. We see in democracy the outward expression of the rule of the Divine in human minds and hearts. It is God's way of showing to men their obligations to one another, His means of bringing in a universal brotherhood on the earth, which shall be one with the universal humanity as seen in the complex of the Greatest Man.

But I am not quite sure that our eyes are yet open to see the nature of this universal brotherhood on the earth. We still forget that all men are our brothers. Some of us still insolently answer back to God, "Am I my brother's keeper?" But always the voice of God cries out to us from

the silence, "What hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground."

Men still refuse to think of others as their brothers. Sometimes it is because of jealousy, but always because of selfishness. We will not tolerate the thought of a brown man, or a red man, or a yellow man, or a black man, as our brother. He is not like us; therefore we slay him by refusing to recognize our common brotherhood. Nor if we are rich will we tolerate a poor man. Only other rich men are really our brothers. And if we are poor, we feel that we are cast out from brotherhood, and we resent it. The spirit of Cain is the spirit of selfishness. It thinks only of itself, and it cares only for itself, and it is always murderous.

From the beginning of time men have exploited their brothers—robbed them of their rights as children of a common Heavenly Father, and killed them by stunting their life and opportunities—that is, when they did not kill them by the sword.

I wish that we might get the vision of brotherhood, admit the principle of democracy, of freedom and opportunity for all, that we might enter now into the new Christian brotherhood of the human race; but I fear that we have much to suffer yet before we shall be purged of our evils. Our vision of brotherhood must be more than a dream; it must be patiently worked out into life.

Let us learn a lesson from the past. Is not the history of the world a long red record of wars and bloodshed between nations, and of oppression within nations? Greedy kings desired the lands and wealth of some neighbor, and marshalled their subjects to go out and rob and kill. Most wars have meant only greed on the part of those who inspired them, unless they were wars of rebellion against greed. It is true that we think that now we have learned the lesson of war; but so long as we admit the thought of greed in our own hearts, war is sure to break out again.

Look back at the history of the ancient world, and you may be readier to admit the oppression within those nations than you might be willing to do in the case of our

own nation. Think of the history of Egypt, of Assyria, of Babylon, and picture to yourselves their mighty works built by oppressed slaves or subjects to gratify the whim of those who ought to have been elder brothers. The history of Rome is another heart-breaking illustration of man's inhumanity to man, of the spirit of unbrotherliness, of cruel selfishness. It strove by its laws and its institutions to stamp out the spirit of brotherhood. It gave all power to the rich and made all others slaves. And Rome, as well as Egypt and Assyria and Babylon, their civilizations destroyed, lie under the débris of the ages.

Has not the relation throughout recorded history been always that of master and servant, or even master and slave? It was only fifty years ago or more that we saw in this country that slavery was contrary to the laws of God, which are the laws of brotherhood. Until that time we believed that white men had received the right from the common Father of us all to make the black race, or any other seemingly inferior race, our chattel slaves; in other words, that might made right.

Let me ask a question of those who believe that there should always be a poorer class among us to be exploited by those who have the power: Is such a belief warranted by the teachings of our common Lord and Savior Jesus Christ? Who made one class masters and another servants? God, or man? Who gave authority to one class of men to monopolize God's gifts for their own exclusive benefit, permitting those who serve only to have enough to continue them as useful servants? Slavery was devoutly believed in as a Christian institution by honest men and women, until some others saw the monstrousness of it and denied it. It took a long and bitter war to change men's minds; but now there are none to defend it.

Is there no industrial slavery today? Are there none who are compelled to work early and late merely to keep a roof over their heads and raiment on their backs and food in their stomachs, with no hope of anything better for them or their children, unless they or their children can by some sudden turn of fortune break into the higher caste

of capital? I can find no warrant in the Word of God for the possession by any man of incredible wealth, while millions live in poverty and wretchedness.

I wish it were possible for us to get a new vision of brotherhood, of the solidarity of the race; yes, of the religion which the Lord Jesus Christ came to the earth to reveal. We would see that ritual, while beautiful, is not the essential thing of religion; that indeed it is not religion at all, but merely something that appeals to our æsthetic sense. We would see that dogmatism is not religion, however much doctrines may be needful to show us how to live. We would see that no acts of piety in themselves are religion, but only helpful to inspire religion in our hearts. We would see that true religion is to love all men as brothers, and work for them; yes, to live for them as we work and live for ourselves.

If we think of this idea of brotherhood we get a new idea of loving others. Let us say to ourselves every morning when we look afresh upon the world: "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." That is the kind of Christianity to be emphasized today. It is the only kind the Lord ever emphasized. It rejects utterly the spirit of Cain. It says, "Yes, this man, that man, all men are my brothers. They need my help. I am going to give it to them as far as I can do so. I am going not only to be kind to them as a neighbor might in the acts of daily life, but I am going to try to think out and plan for the deliverance of men from wage slavery, from industrial slavery, and try to see that all men are actually free to live and develop as my brothers in the kingdom of God."

You and I and all the rest of mankind are as one man in the sight of God. If I sin against another, I am really sinning against myself, against the general body of which I am a member. Another's wrongs are my wrongs; another's joys are my joys; because we are all brethren, all members of the body of Christ, the *Maximus Homo* of time and eternity.

Have you caught the vision? Are you ready in your own person to help bring about its realization? If not,

the dream is not for you. If you have, and will love others as your brothers, some day you will have the joy, the ineffable joy, of being received as an integral part of the Grand Man of heaven, of the spiritual democracy of the universe.

WALTER B. MURRAY.

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION.*

By Prof. Frank W. Very.

THE literature on the doctrine of the gradual evolution of plant and animal life through modification of previously existing forms is so extensive that the publication of a new work on the subject would hardly call for notice outside of strictly scientific circles, were it not that Scott's "Theory of Evolution" endeavors to make a judicial summation of the evidence which has accumulated up to the present time. This it does with one notable exception, namely, that no notice is taken of the memorable work by Kropotkin.† To supply this omission, the latter is included in the present review.

In his preface, Professor Scott explains that his book is largely written to correct that very general misunderstanding which confounds the demonstrated fact of evolution with the hypotheses put forth for its explanation by Charles Darwin, some of them true, at least in part, but all of them requiring modification with the certainty that not only the historic "Darwinism," but also those views which now form the currently accepted doctrine of evolution, are all more or less imperfect, that they are bound to grow and to change under the constant accession of new facts, giving place to a wider outlook which will come with the passing of early preconceptions and misconceptions, and with the entrance

* *The Theory of Evolution, with Special Reference to the Evidence upon which it is Founded.* By William Berryman Scott, Ph.D., LL.D., Blair Professor of Geology and Paleontology in Princeton University. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1917. 183 pp., 13 fig., 12mo. Price $1.00.

† *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution.* By P. Kropotkin. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1916. 240 pp., 8vo. Price $1.25.

upon a new and more genuinely philosophic phase of thought.

In the text, the author sometimes speaks of the evolutionary "hypothesis," but the title of his book, as well as the whole trend of his argument, shows that in his view there is nothing hypothetical about the general thesis, but only as to some of its details.

Lamarck's *"Philosophie Zoölogique"* contained the theorizing of a student of classification, and stipulated a continual change of animal forms through the development and perfection of their organs by use, or, on the other hand, their atrophy as an effect of disuse, which resulted on account of constant changes in the environment, this making necessary the effort of living beings to adapt themselves to their surroundings.

Though difficulties have been urged and an immense amount of controversy has arisen on the subject of heredity, which Lamarck simply took for granted, nevertheless, stated in this general way, Lamarck's thesis has had quite a little confirmation by the experimental method. Thus:

> By keeping water-fleas in the dark, Kapterew caused them to grow blind, the eyes losing their regular outline, and their black pigment began to wander over the head and body. At first this deterioration appeared sporadically, but after a year and a quarter all the individuals were similarly affected and the blindness appeared to be hereditary. (Scott's "Theory of Evolution," p. 153.)

By increasing the proportion of dissolved salt, Schmankewitsch caused the brine-shrimp to develop after several generations into a form identical with what had previously been supposed to be a distinct species; and, on the other hand, by progressively freshening the water, he found that after many generations a new fresh-water *genus* was produced.

By complete change of food or climate during the larval or pupal stages, various species of butterflies and moths can be made *in a single generation* to assume wholly different coloration, even to the formation of new patterns in the markings, and occasionally with some change in the

general form, though in the main such alterations would ordinarily be classed as superficial. These changes, however, are not permanent, but revert to the original form on restoration of the usual conditions.

There is a common viviparous salamander, black with yellow spots, living in damp woods.

> If adult salamanders of this species are kept for years on yellow soil, the yellow spots and blotches greatly enlarge, encroaching on the black ground, and the effects of this treatment are much increased in the second generation, showing a cumulative action (p. 156).
>
> By injecting various substances into the young seed-capsule, when the germs are becoming ready for fertilization by the pollen, MacDougal effected some very remarkable changes, which were hereditary through four or more generations and remained stable, the plants exhibiting no tendency to return to the parent type (p. 157).

These variations, and others like them, cannot be discriminated from those which are awarded specific rank. They may be regarded as exceptional and yet as not overpassing permissible bounds; but to decide how much change can be tolerated requires further investigation by mathematical methods. These are not introduced by Scott; but in the third chapter of his book on "Darwinism," Alfred Russel Wallace has summarized a wide range of observations on what may be called the normal "variability of species in a state of nature." Such variation may be represented by a somewhat regular curve which is not unlike the geometrical representation of the mathematician's curve of probability. There are numerous cases of slight divergence in either direction from the type, with increasingly fewer examples of the wider divergences as these grow greater. A simultaneous wide variation from the norm in several characteristics would usually be accepted as defining a distinct species. The probabilities are against such simultaneous variation.

While, to many, the experimental proof that variations of specific, or even of generic importance can arise in animals and plants living in a state of nature and after only short intervals of time, will appear especially convincing,

and for such Professor Scott reserves it for his final argument, there are others to whom the surest proof of the actuality of an immensely long series of changes through the inaccessible ages of geological history, will be given by the simultaneous consensus of diverse lines of research, all of which tell the same story. Thus we have:

(1) The evidence from classification, where systematists find it possible to arrange living and extinct forms along more or less converging lines, often resulting in extensive series of gradually changing and related members with scarcely a break. The Linnæan dictum, that species are absolutely distinct, separate creations which can be rigorously defined, has had to be abandoned in favor of Lamarck's contention that there are gradations and passages from one species to another, so that it is very difficult to assign the boundaries of a species, or to decide upon the characteristics which shall constitute specific rank—all of which favors the doctrine of continuous progressive change.

(2) The variation of animals and plants under domestication was one of Charles Darwin's great contributions to this subject. Here the choice in the direction which variation shall take has been governed by the needs, and often by the caprice of man. The different varieties of dogs differ among themselves more than most species do, yet there can be no doubt that they are all domesticated wolves, and the differentiation has not proceeded so far as to prevent dogs from inter-breeding with wolves.

A remarkable example of a new form which appeared in captivity is that of a derivation of the American Lunar Moth, brought to Switzerland for its silk in 1870 by the entomologist Boll. The moths of the next generation, raised on foreign soil and fed on the leaves of the European walnut, had such pronounced differences that they were named as a new species by Dr. Gemminger. They are thus described by Moritz Wagner:

> At the first glance, the connoisseur is surprised by the striking change of form. In the new species, the shape of the body, as of the wings, is somewhat larger and heavier, while the feathery antennæ are slightly narrower and less luxuriant.

From the long hind-body of the new species, the carmine-red, longitudinal stripes, which the parent species bears, have completely disappeared. The front wings have a less sinuous form, but are somewhat broader. This change of form is to be more decidedly observed in the tail-like prolongation of the hind wings. Not less striking than the differences of shape are those of color. In the ancestral species the color is a yellowish-green, while that of the new species is a beautiful lemon-yellow. The carmine-red marginal stripe, with whitish inner border, borne on the anterior wings of *Saturnia luna*, has quite disappeared in *Saturnia bolli*, and is indicated only by a very narrow, dark yellowish coloring of the outermost margin. Most remarkable in this new species is the appearance of a new marking on the anterior wings, which appears as a transverse stripe, with somewhat zig-zag outer edge, but is entirely absent from the anterior wings of the parent species (quoted by Scott, p. 40–41).

Such an instance may conceivably represent a reversion to an ancestral form, but it is equally possible that it constitutes the birth of a new species, here quickened into action through man's agency, but requiring only a sufficient duration of the circumstances which led to its production, for it to become permanent. In this view every species contains within it innumerable new species in potency, whose ultimation awaits the presentation of circumstances favorable to their reception.

(3) The study of comparative anatomy makes known a great variety of forms in one and the same organ when applied to different uses, but all of them produced according to a definite rule after a few common types. The extinct flying reptile, the *Pterodactyl,* had an enormously elongated "little" finger which served as a spar to which the wing-membrane was attached; but except for the lengthening, no change was involved in the plan of this member. It was one of five fingers, the others being normal, and provided with claws.

Birds solve the flight problem in an entirely different way by the attachment to a strengthened second finger (as well as to the bones of the forearm) of a series of flight feathers, these, and all of the feathers, being modifications of reptilian scales, now found in their ancestral form only on the bird's feet.

The mammalian bat gives another wholly independent method of flight, founded on the lengthening of all of the fingers except the thumb, and their use as stretchers for a fold of skin; but again there are no new bones and no change in a fundamental skeletal plan.

The body of man is arranged on a general, or universal plan; and the infinite adaptability of this plan to every conceivable mode of life is one of the wonders of vertebrate anatomy. Other vertebrates differ from man and from each other usually either by the elimination of a few parts, or by the exaggeration of certain special ones. Comparative anatomy studies the relation between these homologous parts, showing the fundamental identity of such apparently dissimilar locomotive organs as the bird's wing and the foreleg of a horse, and how each may be developed from one common type form; and this relation, while not absolutely demonstrative of a common origin, "finds its most probable explanation in community of descent."*

(4) Embryology teaches us that remnants of ancestral history are stamped in effigy upon the early embryonic stages of a new organism. It is true that not all of these features are *palingenetic,* or reminiscent of a long inheritance. Some of them "have been secondarily introduced in response to the changing needs of embryonic or larval life. These secondary features are termed *cenogenetic*" (p. 60); but enough of historic interest remains to make the study of these traces important. The idea that these structures recapitulate past history has given rise to some of the most fascinating chapters of anatomical research. Many of these "hypothetical phylogenies" are so speculative that they cannot be accepted in the absence of other corroborative testimony; but some of them have been already confirmed by independent paleontological research. To cite only one of the most elementary facts of embryology, the appearance of gill-slits in every vertebrate embryo may be accepted as reminiscent of the truth made known by paleontology that

* Otto Maas — "*Die Abstammungslehre*" — Jena: 1911, p. 259; quoted by Scott.

the first vertebrates were fishes, while the earliest fishes were of the group which includes the shark, in which the gill-slits are permanent to this day. We are reminded that the first beginnings of spiritual life are in a lowest degree which may be likened to an aqueous medium, and that affections for knowledges (to which fishes correspond) have to precede.* The analogy of this imagery looks forward as well as backward, and these structures are preserved as if it were on purpose for our instruction.

The historical interpretation is no mere fancy. If in a screw steamer,

> recognizable remnants of paddle-boxes, of bearings for a transverse shaft, and the like, are found; what would be the inevitable conclusion? No one would maintain that a naval architect, in possession of his senses, in constructing a screw-steamer would deliberately introduce features which are useful and appropriate only in a paddle-boat. The only reasonable explanation would be that the vessel had originally been built as a paddle-boat and had subsequently been converted into a screw-steamer and in the conversion it had not been found necessary completely to eradicate all traces of the original construction. Obviously, the same reasoning applies to rudimentary organs. The only satisfactory explanation of such useless remnants is that their possessors are descendants of ancestors in which those organs were fully functional. It seems quite absurd to assume that, in a separately and specially created animal, useless structures, reminiscent of other animals in which the same structures are useful and valuable, should be included, merely to indicate ideal relationships and community of plan (p. 66, 67).

(5) The researches of Nuttall and Graham-Smith† have thrown unexpected light upon the relationships of various animals, confirming the close connection of some forms, a connection which had already been made known by paleontology, and suggesting others which are novel, but not at all improbable. Thus the warm-blooded, air-

* See the writer's study of the correspondence of fishes in this REVIEW for July, 1900, p. 348–351.

† "Blood Immunity and Blood Relationship by G. H. F. Nuttall, including Original Researches by G. L. Graham-Smith and T. S. P. Strangeways."—Cambridge: 1904.

breathing whales, their young brought forth in the usual mammalian manner and fed on mother's milk, have no intimate relations with the fishes. Professor Flower has suggested remote skeletal affinities with the ungulates, but on the whole their relationship has been exceedingly problematical. The blood-test, however, shows that the most nearly related land animal is the pig. The two agree in a common tendency to lay on fat, but in little else, except in this remarkable fact that through long ages of evolution and after an extraordinary diversity of experiences, a peculiar composition of the blood is retained as a testimony of a common ancestry.

The blood-reaction brings out the near relation of the llama to the camel, already well understood from the first principles of classification, between the deer family and other ruminants, between the horseshoe crab and scorpions, between lizards and snakes, and so on.

These experiments indicate that there is a close relationship between lizards and snakes, on the one hand, turtles and crocodiles, on the other. They further indicate that birds are more nearly allied with the turtle-crocodile series than with the lizard-snake series, results for which paleontological studies had already prepared us (p. 79).

(6) The numerous serial progressions of the paleontological record furnish the backbone to the evolutionary theory. Here we can trace the derivation of the one-toed horse from the little four-toed *Eohippus* of the early Eocene through a long series of intermediate forms. We can see the successive stages in the transition from the low-crowned and comparatively simple teeth of the early creature to the high-crowned, ever-growing, complicated arrangement of dentine, enamel and cement, whose unequal wear gives the uneven surface needed for "the masticating of grasses, which are among the most abrasive of plants" (p. 103).

This transformation of the teeth indicates a change from the habit of browsing upon leaves and other soft vegetable substances, to grazing, or feeding upon the hard, abrasive grasses, and it is highly suggestive that this coincided with, or quickly followed the spread of grassy plains, which afforded a new and abundant supply of nutritious food (p. 103).

Simultaneously with this development of the teeth, the eye, which in *Eohippus* was directly over the teeth, passed successively farther and farther back until it is now entirely outside of the great maxillary development needed to give room for the deep tooth-sockets of the modern horse. The ball-and-socket joint of the humerus would be out of place and a source of danger in the horse. Its form has therefore been altered until the joint can move only in a fore-and-aft direction; because in the horse everything else is sacrificed in order to attain the utmost rectilinear speed and to stand the racking motion of the gallop.

Similar developmental series can be made out for many other creatures. They show always the evolutionary road and often the reason of it. "When sufficient well-preserved material, leading through long periods of time, can be obtained, the result is always suggestive of a gradual development" (p. 118).

(7) We have the further evidence of current geographical distribution of plants and animals in favor of the evolutionary theory.

The appearance in any given area of new forms may either be through the modification of older forms which previously inhabited that area, or by immigration from some other region. It is therefore not to be taken for granted that any group originated in the region where we happen first to find it; quite as frequently it arose in some other region and spread gradually from that. A very instructive illustration of this principle is afforded by the history of the elephants, which appeared suddenly (lower Miocene) in Europe and somewhat later (middle Miocene) in North America. In neither continent has anything been found in any preceding formation which could plausibly be regarded as ancestral to these ancient and primitive elephants, which, to all appearances, might have risen up out of the ground, as Buffon fancied that they actually did. However, on evolutionary principles, they must have had ancestors, and the obvious inference was that they had immigrated into the northern continents from some southern land. By a process of elimination, the conclusion was reached that Africa must have been the original home of these animals, a result which has been amply confirmed by discoveries made not long ago in Egypt, which carry the history of the order

much farther back in time than had previously been possible (p. 93, 94).

Some of the strongest supports of the evolutionary theory are found in such facts as the consanguinity of the animals of northern Africa and Europe, which suggested the former existence of land passages between both Italy and Spain across to Africa. Geology confirms this and shows a time of greatest elevation when the Adriatic and Ægean were land, and the Mediterranean was divided into two land-locked seas.

The extraordinary difference between the fossils of North and of South America before the middle of the Cenozoic era indicates that the two continents were then separated. Geology confirms the supposition by assigning this as the date when the isthmus of Panama arose out of the sea, since when, the marine faunas of the two sides of the isthmus have had time to diverge considerably, while the adjoining land faunas have more or less intermingled.

The present position of science on the subject of evolution is well summed up in the following quotation from William Bateson:*

> The many converging lines of evidence point so clearly to the central fact of the origin of the forms of life by an evolutionary process that we are compelled to accept this deduction, but as to almost all the essential features, whether of cause or of mode, by which specific diversity has become what we perceive it to be, we have to confess an ignorance nearly total.

A long list might be made of eminent naturalists who, while recognizing the great merit of Darwin's contributions to the study of evolution, reject in whole or in part the explanations known under the name of "Darwinism." We pass now to other objections to the Darwinian view which have not attracted the attention they deserve.

Fourteen years ago there appeared a work by Peter Kropotkin on "Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution," which brought together in book form a series of articles originally

* "Problems of Genetics." New Haven: 1913, p. 248. Quoted and italicized by Scott (p. 5) as the opinion of one "who rejects Darwinism, one might say, with contumely."

published in the *Nineteenth Century* between 1890 and 1896, emphasizing and extending a view first put forth in germ in a lecture—"On the Law of Mutual Aid"—in 1880, by the Russian zoölogist, Professor Kessler, who died in the following year. The urgent need for the reprint of this book at the present time is thus set forth by its author in his preface to the new edition:

> When the present war began, involving nearly all Europe in a terrible struggle, and this struggle assumed, in those parts of Belgium and France which were invaded by the Germans, a never yet known character of wholesale destruction of life among the non-combatants and pillage of the means of subsistence of the civil population, "struggle for existence" became a favorite explanation with those who tried to find an excuse for these horrors. A protest against such an abuse of Darwin's terminology appeared then in a letter published in the *Times*. It was said in this letter that such an explanation was "little more than an application to philosophy and politics of ideas taken from crude popular misconceptions of the Darwinian theory (of 'struggle for existence' and 'will to power,' 'survival of the fittest' and 'superman,' etc.)"; that there was, however, a work in English "which interprets biological and social progress not in terms of overbearing brute force and cunning, but in terms of mutual co-operation." It was suggested, therefore, that a cheap reprint of this book should be published without delay.

It is to be hoped that the reappearance of this book at the present time will lead to its examination not only by students of nature, but by humanitarians; for the elevation of Kessler's principle of *Mutual Aid* to as high a place as Darwin's *Mutual Struggle,* ought to constitute a new epoch in evolutionary theory. Kropotkin's book covers a wide range and is already so condensed that it cannot easily be summarized. It should be read *in toto.* Long an exile from his native land, but now able to return there as a result of the Russian revolution, the author stands before the world as a historic figure. The most confirmed republican need not hesitate to give to Prince Kropotkin his hereditary title, for he is surely a prince among men—prince of socialists and prince of scientists—a humanitarian and a man of learning. We need him today. The world

still worships at the altar of Mammon, but with the passing away of the riches of Mammon, tomorrow may see it return to the worship of the living God. The "Reptilian Age" of humanity is passing. The Dragon dies, that the Angel may live. Blessed be the name of the Lord!

The value of the principle of association is thus summed up by Kropotkin:

> Life in societies enables the feeblest insects, the feeblest birds, and the feeblest mammals to resist, or to protect themselves from, the most terrible birds and beasts of prey; it permits longevity; it enables the species to rear its progeny with the least waste of energy and to maintain its numbers albeit [by] a very slow birth-rate; it enables the gregarious animals to migrate in search of new abodes. Therefore, while fully admitting that force, swiftness, protective colors, cunningness, and endurance to hunger and cold, which are mentioned by Darwin and Wallace, are so many qualities making the individual, or the species, the fittest under certain circumstances, we maintain that under *any* circumstances sociability is the greatest advantage in the struggle for life. Those species which willingly or unwillingly abandon it are doomed to decay; while those animals which know best how to combine, have the greatest chances of survival and of further evolution, although they may be inferior to others in *each* of the faculties enumerated by Darwin and Wallace, save the intellectual faculty. The highest vertebrates, and especially mankind, are the best proof of this assertion. As to the intellectual faculty, while every Darwinist will agree with Darwin that it is the most powerful arm in the struggle for life, and the most powerful factor of further evolution, he also will admit that intelligence is an eminently social faculty. Language, imitation, and accumulated experience are so many elements of growing intelligence of which the unsociable animal is deprived. Therefore we find, at the top of each class of animals, the ants, the parrots, and the monkeys, all combining the greatest sociability with the highest development of intelligence. The fittest are thus the most sociable animals, and sociability appears as the chief factor of evolution, both directly, by securing the well-being of the species while diminishing the waste of energy, and indirectly, by proving the growth of intelligence (*Op. cit.*, p. 49-50).

Speaking of the consignment of English workhouse children to be virtual slaves in factories, against which the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury protested so vigorously, Kropotkin says:

But it must also be said that all fault for such treatment must not be thrown entirely upon the criminality of human nature. Were not the teachings of men of science, and even of a notable portion of the clergy, up to a quite recent time, teachings of distrust, despite and almost hatred towards the poorer classes? Did not science teach that since serfdom has been abolished, no one need be poor unless for his own vices? And how few in the Church had the courage to blame the children-killers, while the great numbers taught that the sufferings of the poor, and even the slavery of the negroes, were part of the Divine Plan! Was not Nonconformism itself largely a popular protest against the harsh treatment of the poor at the hand of the Established Church? With such spiritual leaders, the feelings of the richer classes necessarily became, as Mr. Plimsoll remarked, not so much blunted as "stratified" (*Op. cit.*, p. 216).

The religious charitable associations, which again represent a whole world, certainly must be mentioned in this place. There is not the slightest doubt that the great bulk of their members are moved by the same mutual-aid feelings which are common to all mankind. Unhappily the religious teachers of men prefer to ascribe to such feelings a supernatural origin. Many of them pretend that man does not consciously obey the mutual-aid inspiration, so long as he has not been enlightened by the teachings of the special religion which they represent, and, with St. Augustin, most of them do not recognize such feelings in the "pagan savage." Moreover, while early Christianity, like all other religions, was an appeal to the broadly human feelings of mutual aid and sympathy, the Christian Church has aided the State in wrecking all standing institutions of mutual aid and support which were anterior to it, or developed outside of it; and, instead of the *mutual aid* which every savage considers as due to his kinsman, it has preached *charity* which bears a character of inspiration from above, and, accordingly, implies a certain superiority of the giver upon the receiver (*Op, cit.*, p. 210-211).

As an example of the "mutual aid which every savage considers as due to his kinsman," which any one may compare with the sort of consideration meted out by neighbors in so-called Christian lands, I take the following account of the Non-Aryan hill tribes of India, based on personal sojourn of many years among them, which was sent to me by my valued correspondent, S. E. Peal, Esq., an English tea-planter of Sibsagar, Assam, in 1896:

Quite unwittingly they actually enjoy what the masses of our Western laboring population vaguely and vainly yearn after. . . . Taking our "Nagas" all through the hills S. E. of Assam as example, let us glance at their social system.

First, there are no landlords; the land belongs to the community. There are no middle men, no monied class, no "working class," for all work. Each village has its plot or plots, subdivided by the village council amongst the various families; and each adult has his vote or voice, and his share in the land. If at clearing time a man is ill, the community, or his own subdivision of it, turn out as a duty and clear the land for him; same at reaping time. If a man's house is burnt, the community as a point of honor and duty, not only rebuild it again, but stock it with the needful implements, stores of grain, etc., for nothing. So far there is little or no direct taxation; in lieu of it, we see public works executed by communal labor.

After the rains, the tribal or village paths are cleared of jungle, steps or foot-holds made on the steep slopes, cane or log bridges repaired. If the "morongs" or council-guest houses need it, they are rebuilt, the fortifications put in order. Each section of the community executes its appointed share, supervised by elders; there is no shirking and no payment. Although there is no written language, the education of the young is more or less compulsory, and they are taught what is useful; and among many tribes, the boys are segregated in barracks and graded, having considerable discipline and training. Each adult man as a rule is a proprietor, having his house, lands, and duties; and all are settled agriculturists. There are no lawyers, police, or padlocks.

Mr. Peal was of the opinion that "all round there is more liberty, leisure, and real happiness among them than among our toiling masses at home." Read William Morris's "House of the Wolfings" and see if this pagan association for mutual aid had not more of genuine brotherly love than some of the refined associations of ascetics which hardly deserve the name of "Christian," even granting that the latter may have a limited embodiment of the principle of mutual aid which has kept them from being utter failures. The world has lost something precious in abandoning this early communal life. It should have been preserved, improved and enlarged. As to what can be accomplished when true Christian charity descends to earth as the Coming of the Son of Man in a united humanity, with God's

truth acknowledged as the only law, we can probably have no conception. What new enlightenment may there not be when natural science turns to spiritual truth, not begrudgingly as to a permissible "hypothesis," but wholeheartedly! Professor Scott says: "In order to hold the evolutionary hypothesis, it is not necessary to deny the ideal relationships between the successive gradations of living beings, or to exclude belief in a creative plan, which has been worked out by the method of evolution. This, however, is a metaphysical, rather than a scientific question, and has no immediate bearing upon the evidences for the theory of evolution" (pp. 30-31). Truly, both Society and Science need to enlarge their views.

If by "metaphysics" is meant a wholly speculative philosophy, apart from any foundation in fact, such philosophy is rightly rejected either for scientific or any other problems. But the practical divorce of scientific from spiritual truth is indefensible. The "plan" is undoubtedly there through all the departments of nature. The origin of the plan is from above, or is *super*natural. Blind chance cannot explain such a perfect and elaborate arrangement. For its rational consideration we need Swedenborg's doctrines of degrees and forms. Professor Scott does not deny the existence of ideals, or principles higher than the material forms in which they are clothed; but, on the other hand, he does not consider them explicitly, and this persistent ignoring of the spiritual as irrelevant in questions that concern *creation,* which is of purely spiritual origin, has the practical effect of a denial of the divine in nature. We can interpret the phrasing, if we wish, in accordance with spiritual conceptions, but with some doubt as to whether the author desires us to so read it. Thus, where he speaks of "the natural origin of species," referring simply to an apparent order of development of species in nature, the phrase does not deny that there may be a spiritual origin back of the appearance of simple natural sequence; but one may question whether the choice of the phrase would have been the same if the spiritual idea had been uppermost in the author's mind. This failure to acknowledge the divine

in the name of the *whole* truth, must be placed alongside of the omission by the leaders of society of "the weightier matters of the law—judgment, mercy, and faith" in respect to brotherhood. A full and rational consideration of the subject of creation demands treatment from the spiritual and the natural sides conjointly; and now that the old acrimony of debate between the two points of view, considered as rivals, has about died out, there is the possibility of a more sane relationship in a renewed discussion with wider and wiser premises.

In the ordinary use of language we often speak of causes or origins without implying any exact or profoundly philosophical meaning in the terms, and such loose usage does no harm where the meaning is perfectly obvious; but in a philosophic discussion where the choice of a word may imply a complete right-about-face, such choice is neither irrelevant nor unimportant.

The Darwinian doctrine of the "origin" of species by natural selection insistently requires a whole category of antecedent doctrines, or else the term becomes a complete misnomer. In fact, the name "natural selection" presupposes something to be selected which necessarily takes precedence, so that selection can only be said to be *originating* in a secondary and quite subordinate sense.

Relegating the principle of selection to its true place as a subordinate detail in a complex process, the prime fact of evolution is the tendency of all living things to vary. Whether variation is by minute and therefore very long-drawn-out, or gradual transitions, or whether it has come by more or less sudden "mutations," as von Waagen supposed, or sometimes by one and sometimes by the other, is a further detail. To be precise, the *origin* of a new living form must be assigned to the moment of its conception, or entrance into time as a distinct embodiment of what otherwise would be a diffuse universal principle awaiting reception by an appropriate form. Creation is both immediate and mediate. Always there are two parts to the process—variation *and* selection, or *influx* and *reception*. Because God is infinite, there is the tendency to indefinite

variation in all that proceeds from Him. Selection is the finiting of the flow in a particular channel.*

Since sustentation is, like inception, both an immediate influx of divine creative energy, and mediate modification of the receptive forms through the action of the environment and through habit, science can deal with the mediative change by the study of the resultant forms. By the conception of a dual germ plasm (for which see the writer's account of Dr. Reichardt's hypothesis in this REVIEW for July, 1915), the retention of the inceptive form (whether identical with and thus, in a sense, a continuation of an ancestral form, or mutated) at the same time that there is a selection of the modifications arising from individual development, may be explained. Natural science infers many of these subordinate processes from innumerable vestigial traces in which their record is written on the organism.

To Swedenborg we owe the doctrine that creation has not been merely an instantaneous divine act at some indefinite remote epoch in the past, but that creation is continued through generation. From the angels he learned "that in our world [where spirits and angels dwell] such things [as are seen in the natural world] are created in a moment by God according to the affections of the angels; but in your world they were at first created in an analogous manner; but it was provided that they should afterwards be perpetually renewed by the propagation of one from another, and that creation should be continued in the same way" (True Christian Religion, n. 78).

Through the teaching of Swedenborg, we have learned that influx and reception are the dual mechanism of creation, a fact which has been only obscurely recognized by science. Perhaps the first after Swedenborg to distinctly state that there are two parts to creation was Chambers in

* For possible modes by which influx from the spiritual sun may act, see papers by the writer in *The New Christianity:* "The Origin of Noxious Things," Vol. ix, p. 86, June, 1896; "The New-Church Attitude towards the Doctrine of Evolution," Vol. xiii, p. 36, March, 1900; "Current Comments on Evolution," Vol. xiii, p. 135, September, 1900.

the tenth edition of his "Vestiges of Creation" (p. 155), where he says:

> The several series of animated beings, from the simplest and oldest up to the highest and most recent, are, under the providence of God, the results, first, of an impulse which has been imparted to the forms of life; advancing them in definite times, by generation, through grades of organization terminating in the highest dicotyledons and vertebrata, these grades being few in number, and generally marked by intervals of organic character, which we find to be a practical difficulty in ascertaining affinities; second, of another impulse connected with the vital forces, tending, in the course of generations, to modify organic structures in accordance with external circumstances.

Swedenborg goes further and says: "In everything created, greatest as well as least, there are these three, end, cause and effect. A created thing in which these three are not, is impossible" (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 154). He also tells us that creation cannot be understood without the knowledge that "there are two suns through which all things have been created by the Lord, the sun of the spiritual world and the sun of the natural world. All things were created by the Lord through the sun of the spiritual world, not through the sun of the natural world, since the latter is far below the former; it is in middle distance; above it is the spiritual world, and below it is the natural world. This sun of the natural world was created to render aid, as a kind of substitute" (*ibid.*, n. 153). The language here is somewhat metaphorical. The "distances" are of degrees. Even the distance of the natural sun from "the natural world" refers not so much to the spatial distance between sun and earth, but to the totally different orders of their several constitutions and activities. "There are infinite things in God-Man, consequently things without limit in the sun which is the first proceeding from Him; these countless things are presented as in an image, in the created universe. From this it is that no one thing can anywhere be precisely like another" (*ibid.*, n. 155).

Darwin and Wallace rejected the conception of sudden mutations through generative "impulse" in favor of a gradual accumulation of minute variations; but de Vries has

demonstrated that the sudden mutations, asserted by von Waagen, exist in certain groups of plants; and while "natural selection" will account for some things, there are others which it utterly fails to explain. Thus Fabre has pointed out * that the female digger-wasp, *Ammophila hirsuta,* paralyzes the caterpillar on which her young are to feed, by stinging and poisoning every one of the caterpillar's ganglia before she lays her egg on it. If this were not done, if even a single ganglion were omitted, the caterpillar would thrash around and destroy the delicate egg. How does the wasp learn the right way to do this and to do it always in exactly the same way? Evidently not by the experimental method, for there are a dozen ganglia to be stung, and a mistake will be fatal to that generation of wasps. Therefore the correct method could not have been gradually acquired, for long before the right way would have been hit upon by the method of trial and error, the race of wasps would have become extinct. The act is from the start always continued to completion, methodically, with a surety of aim which could not be improved upon if the creature were a profound student of the anatomy of the caterpillar.

Scientific opinion is practically unanimous in affirming that evolution is a fact, and yet is unable to agree in regard to an explanation of this fact; but the reason for this want of agreement is not recognized. To one who views the subject in spiritual light it may be suggested that one cause of failure is the lack of true reason at the very entrance upon the problem; because, in the consideration of an interaction between two factors, one of the factors has not been understood, or has been neglected as unimportant; whereas the time has come when the whole world should recognize that to be satisfied with mere appearances is to miss the real substance of things. Swedenborg says:

> That the Rational is conceived from celestial good as a father, but not from spiritual truth as a mother. . . . Man is born into nothing rational, but only into the faculty of receiving it. . . . But there is constantly something (namely,

* "The Hunting Wasps," English Edn., p. 270.

Divine celestial good) inflowing from the interior, which receives the things which thus enter, and disposes them into order (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 2557).

If celestial good were the father of rational thought, would not the principle of mutual aid be welcomed? It is true that before accepting this as a leading principle in both animal and human evolution, it must be subjected to further tests from the outside world, for "nothing of truth enters by influx through man's internal, but only through his external," as we are informed in the same number; but without interior perception, the best of facts do not avail to make rational thought.

It appears that man becomes rational through sensuous and scientific things; but this is a fallacy. Good from the Lord constantly inflows and occurs through the rational faculty of man, and adopts the scientifics to itself; and, in proportion as it can do this, and dispose them rightly, in the same proportion he becomes rational (*ibid.*, n. 2577).

Those who have blinded themselves by this — that they were unwilling to believe anything which they could not comprehend by the senses, till at length they believe nothing — were formerly called serpents of the tree of knowledge (*ibid.*, n. 2588).

In addition to the omission of the fundamental principle of *spiritual influx* (in which is power) from the scientific discussions, there have also been equally serious and wholesale omissions of vital principles in Church and State, and in the ordinary affairs of men; and these especially affect that part of evolution which more immediately concerns the human race, retarding its progress. Swedenborg's doctrine of the *Maximus Homo*, as applied to this earth, has never been fully realized. Without a supreme, or supernational government and a just international court of universal jurisdiction, the "Grand Man" of this earth is a body without a head. All of the evolution of human relations on this earth has progressively tended towards the establishment of organic manifestation of this larger life.* The

* See the writer's study of the *Maximus Homo* on this earth — "Society as an Organized Human Form," Part I to V, — *The New Christianity:* Vol. xiv, pp. 99, 124, 134, 172, and Vol. xv, p. 28.

present awful calamity of a great world war should convince every one who is open to enlightenment, that the universal humanity of this earth needs to receive a heart of good will from the Lord, and a head of rational principles, and to enter into one universal brotherhood which shall abolish national rivalries, hatred, lust of conquest and commercial greed, receiving in their place, mutual helpfulness and appreciation. The union of nations into a single organically constructed international government, founded on and guaranteeing the principles of the American Declaration of Independence, would go far towards abolishing war. This great consummation does, indeed, seem to be visibly nearer. It is the Coming of the Son of Man—the immanent approach of the Lord God as the inmost soul of a restored, a resuscitated humanity, raised from the dead, filled with His presence, ready to follow Him in the regeneration, becoming thereby the Kingdom of God on earth, a new order of Society, the *Maximus Homo* of the earth, one with the *Maximus Homo* of the universal heavens.

But before a New Earth, ready for righteousness, can come down from heaven, many ancient prejudices must be overthrown. Everybody admits that state tariffs between the units of these United States would be almost as absurd as tariffs between individual towns. In this country we manage very well without them. They are equally unnecessary between nations. They constitute an insidious sort of warfare, and disputes concerning them are among the causes which have led to the present war.

A just distribution of the rewards of labor, and the safeguarding of legislation against plutocratic control, are two of the most needed of internal reforms in this as in other nations. Without deciding *a priori* between various remedies which are advocated—government ownership and control of communal uses, single-tax, and other more or less socialistic schemes—it is safe to say that the experimental method and local freedom to try economic experiments, would very soon demonstrate which of rival theories is the better one.

At the present epoch in the world's history, when changes

of customs, methods and conditions of life and of government are taking place with extraordinary rapidity, many worthy people are disturbed in mind because of the new position demanded and from time to time assumed by women in the body politic. It is natural that a people which feels that "there's no place like home," should view with dread any change which appears to threaten that institution even remotely. We all know that the home rests on marriage, and will therefore be affected by any change in the relation of man and woman. But there is also a relation between the home and the State, or society and our country as the larger home; and to many of us it has become evident that this larger relation has already changed to such an extent that it is now imperative that women shall no longer stand aloof from affairs of State. The advice and coöperation of women are urgently needed on a host of new problems which are coming up for solution. The preservation of the home itself, for which woman has always stood sponsor, demands that she come out from the privacy of its seclusion into the arena of public discussion—that she be empowered both to speak and to act on questions of public welfare. Who so well as a mother knows the value of a human life? Before sending the flower of manhood to an untimely grave and deliberately wasting the best blood of the nations, so that the world is confronted by the threat that, after the fires of this great conflagration die away, there will be none but the weak or incompetent left to propagate the next generation of weaklings, we can but wish that the women of the world had been consulted. As a matter of simple justice the mothers and future wives on whom the burden of child-bearing falls, should have some voice in the matter of decisions which lead to peace or war. Hideous desecrations of marriage are already in sight. The mere possibility that, urged by the need of further warfare for still more cannon-fodder, laws which shall empower states to commandeer their women to breed, and breed faster, like prize cattle under eugenic control, can be discussed even for a

moment, ought to open the eyes of decent men and women to the *inferno* towards which we at times seem headed.

There are also many injustices and burdens which fall heavily on women even in a nation which purports to be at peace, and for which, without the ballot, they have no redress. It is idle to claim that the senates will listen to their cry. Experience teaches that petitions to legislative bodies receive scant courtesy unless backed by votes.

Darwin in his evolutionary formula laid undue emphasis on *war,* "the struggle for existence," and spoke as if this were the principal means of *progress.* Undoubtedly, warfare may be overruled for eventual good; and by sweeping away obstructing evils, war may open a path for good which has hitherto been suppressed; and the ultimate effect of the liberated good of life may in this case compensate for the temporary misery. Doubtless some of the privileges which we now enjoy have been obtained through blood and suffering; but the immediate effect of war is destruction, degradation and direful wickedness. Prince Kropotkin, in his great book, "Mutual Aid," has brought together a wealth of illustration, exposing the fallacy of the Darwinian thesis and showing everywhere throughout nature and in the world of human activity, innumerable examples of the preponderating influence of helpfulness in securing prosperity and progress. He challenges both science and religion in the name of justice to consider the far-reaching effects of an adhesion to principles of equity. Truly "justice and judgment are the support of His throne"; but justice, or righteousness, comes first, and God's dread judgments which manifest the majesty of offended truth, only endure for a little while, lest iniquities prevail. In the end, and throughout by far the greater part of human experiences and nature's progressions, "sorrow may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." Kropotkin rightly affirms that a more potent evolutionary fact than the "struggle for existence" is "the joy of life"; and he shows us an exuberant nature in which everywhere there is more joy than sorrow, more helpfulness than warfare.

By unduly emphasizing the "struggle for existence" and

the "dissipation of energy," and by neglecting the "joy of life" and the "restoration of energy"—factors which are absolutely necessary for a perpetuated and consistent universe—science has taken on a pessimistic tone. As in some of the poems of Strindberg and Conrad Aiken—poets of woe and malediction—and in much similar current literature and philosophy, majestic but gloomy nightmares, which may be fitting counterparts to the dark days through which we are passing, but which surely do not represent the springs of action of a rejuvenated and rehabilitated humanity, have been substituted for life, so in much that has been promulgated in the name of science, there has been a deliberate closing of the eyes to the wonders of a Divine Providence, which is continually educing order out of chaos, restoring the dead to life, and gathering up the fragments "that nothing be lost." In a warring and despairing world, it is ours to proclaim the message of life and joy, and the evolving of a higher life—even Jehovah's salvation.

FRANK W. VERY.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

RECONSTRUCTION AND RADICALISM

RECONSTRUCTION and radicalism will probably characterize the history of the world for the greater part of the Twentieth Century. Certainly at the present time these impulses are growing with tremendous momentum. The energies of men everywhere are aroused as never before to combination and achievement on a scale which surpasses all previous imagination. All departments, phases, aspects, and activities, and all the institutions, of human life are trembling and quaking with impending change. Philosophies are being overthrown. Governments are crumbling, and the social order is standing aghast before revolution. Education, domestic life, and religion are in the throes of reconstructive and radical agitation. Industrial and political organizations are swayed in the balance of plutocratic and democratic forces. We are living in the midst of wars and rumors of wars. The foundations are shaking. Where and when shall we see the Son of Man coming with power from on high?

It may be that our civilization is tottering to the brink of destruction, that we are witnessing a world catastrophe comparable only to that symbolized by the Flood in Genesis, a catastrophe of which the corruption of Roman civilization and the downfall of the Roman Empire is only a faint suggestion. When such elemental forces are at work as are now displayed in almost world-wide international destruction, it is no time for complacent optimism. We may prophesy and look to Divine Providence to bring good out of evil. But Divine Providence must work with the good that is in men and with the co-operation of men. If the Divine Providence operated directly for good without the co-operation of men, there would be no evil in

the world and no hell of defiant evil hereafter. Men, individual and collective, may go to destruction by persisting in evil. It is all very well to look around and note the good men and the good causes so abundant in our time: philanthropic enterprise and devotion; social, moral, and religious activity and co-operation; scientific and mechanical advances; these are obvious, admirable, and inspiring. They give us courage and hope, but at the same time they remind us that they are all for the most part efforts at alleviation; all various forms of struggle with evil, deep-seated, constant, persistent evil. No one can tell what the outcome will be. Just now the clouds are ominously black. The world has suffered catastrophes before; it may soon suffer the greatest catastrophe of all time. Swedenborg says that a New Church cannot be planted in the soil of the old, but must be established with the remnant and among the Gentiles. Just who, what, or where the remnant is it is hard to say; who the Gentiles are is a question we cannot answer with much assurance. But one thing is certain, the few New-Church people scattered throughout the world must make the most of the light that is intrusted to them to show the way out of this horrible chaos to the ways of peace and love.

Most of the world believes that the unholy combination of imperialism, militarism, and plutocracy, which is best exhibited by the German Empire and which precipitated this monstrous war, must be broken up and the spirit which formed it extirpated before free government can exist and democracy be made safe. This outcome seems sure and speedy, but danger of catastrophe will still be impending. For democracy assured, the primal elements of the conflict, the clashing of human interests, will remain. The struggle between democracy and plutocracy must go on in the future as it has gone on in the past as the one enduring and inevitable conflict between the rights of man and the interests of property. The New Jerusalem when it comes in full measure will doubtless be a democratic city, but it will be ruled by the law of love, not by the force of self-interest. There will be "no need of the sun."

Well-assured optimists and many pious observers, to say nothing of certain interested groups who look for profits and further opportunities for exploitation, think they see in this war a marvelous preparation for enormously expanded human welfare, especially a world-wide kindling of genuine religion. It is undeniable that war calls forth the energies of men powerfully and effectively, but it is also true that the energies of war are for the most part brutal and mechanical; the direct and immediate aim is destruction of life and property. But even worse, it engenders passions which, though supported by appeals to patriotism and other moral qualities, perpetuate hatred, revenge, suspicion, and conflict, thus forever disturbing the peace of the world. Whatever favorable conditions follow upon war are not properly results of the war, but of the good in men which war has not availed to destroy. War, of course, plays havoc with existing conditions and forces sweeping readjustments and untoward concentration of the energies of society. This necessitates many forms of reconstruction. But the reconstruction consequent upon the derangements of war is, like war itself, ephemeral.

In the meantime there are various forms of social discontent, uneasiness, and agitation, which lead to pervasive efforts to find relief and betterment. These conditions proceed from primal constituents of human society, and from permanent and normal human motives. They naturally impel constant reconstructive effort, and develop more or less inevitable radicalism.

The attention of the world is fixed just now upon the epochal transformations and struggles in Russia. Nowhere perhaps at present are the forces of reconstruction and radicalism more portentously exhibited. Russia has been the hotbed of radicalism for generations, and this in spite of the characteristic conservatism of a predominantly rural population. It is in the extraordinary developments now in progress in Russia that we have the best field for observing the traits of radicalism both constructive and destructive.

In general, radicalism is what Professor James called

"a split-off piece of consciousness." It belongs to the category of dreams, trances, fits of abstraction, hypnotism, and multiple personality. Psychologically, it is an extreme case of suggestibility and narrowed attention. A radical is the victim of "fixed ideas," his attention is directed to one object so exclusively that he is blind to all else. In ordinary life attention and suggestibility have marginal fringes of consciousness which keep the mind more or less in touch with wider fields of interest and influence. This gives the mind the quality of poise, self-possession, and comprehensiveness. In plain common sense language, the radical is unbalanced, and in extreme cases insane. With these traits of radicalism go certain moral and spiritual characteristics. The radical is self-assertive, self-sufficient, arrogant, and intolerant. He is blind to the importance of everything but the object of his vision. He maintains the attitude of superiority and infallibility. He is addicted to overweening conceit which amounts often to megalomania and he affects a fancied martyrdom. He lives habitually in the atmosphere of self-delusion and translates his emotions and his ideas into high-flown abstractions and generalities which create for him a fictitious heaven.

These mental and moral characteristics of radicalism are now conspicuous in the anarchists, the pacifists, and the extreme socialists in Russia. These radicals are so narrow-minded and blind that they have lost all real sense of patriotism and are so inordinately suggestible along lines of their prepossessions that they render themselves willing tools of a corrupting German propaganda. They are acting the part of moral and political traitors all the while that they are clinging to their misapplied abstractions and proclaiming the coming of their fictitious heavens. They are so intent upon the object of their fancies that they do not realize the actual concrete conditions under which they are living. The German spies and agents tell them that this is a capitalistic, plutocratic war; and that the laboring classes have no interest in it. They do not stop to reflect that, although (like all wars) this is a plutocratic war, it is also (like all wars) something more, it

involves other issues, besides the particular issue between plutocracy and democracy. The immediate and for the moment the supreme issue in this war is whether a certain combination of plutocracy, imperialism, and militarism, the most powerful and most dangerous, the most deliberate and the most brutal, the world has ever seen, shall crush all democracies and dominate the world. Under the suggestions of German agents and in pursuit of their ill-judged ideas, these insane radicals are paralyzing both the Russian Army and the Russian Government. They are in fact under the plea "thou shalt not kill" conspiring and co-operating with the invading army to kill their own comrades and lay waste their own country.

But the criminal folly of such radicalism is not exhausted in Russia. In the Allied countries, it operates in conjunction with pro-German propaganda to confuse and corrupt public sentiment, and to defeat the action of the governments. This is conspicuously the case in the Socialistic bodies. Socialistic philosophy everywhere is very much under the influence of German radicals, who above all others are blind slaves of abstractions. The Socialists in this country are therefore largely pro-German in fact as well as in sentiment. Some see and some do not that all pacifistic arguments are now pro-German arguments. When a country goes to war it becomes to all intents and purposes a military camp, and the only alternative is patriotism or treason. War is not a democratic institution, but democracy cannot save itself in this war by submitting to German dominion. It is foolish to assert that this is a capitalistic war and ignore the fact that it is German capitalism combined with militarism and imperialism that is seeking world dominion, under which democracy, the mainstay of the working classes, must perish from the earth.

It is thus that radicalism, especially socialistic radicalism, threatens the universal distruction of democratic society and government. It is true that it requires some stretch of the imagination to think of Germany in the rôle of world conquerer, but there is no doubt that this was

and is the pan-German program, and it is a matter of history that Germany has spent nearly fifty years preparing for this rôle. The world was indeed justified in treating such a program with amusement as a national vagary, but if radicalism succeeds in demoralizing the allied armies and disorganizing the allied governments, as it threatens to do in Russia, and as German agents throughout the world are trying to accomplish, it is inevitable that the whole world will fall a prey to German rapacity. This of course is unlikely, but it illustrates the possibilities of radicalism in combination with pan-Germanism.

It is our more immediate as well as our inevitable future concern that radicalism everywhere is by nature a constant threat to all organized society, and just now to our entire Christian civilization, for it is at war with all order, it is in disposition and principle anarchy. The probability is that the German armies will soon be driven from the field, that Germany will be brought to terms and the disease of pan-Germanism eradicated; but the menace of radicalism will remain.

First, and possibly the most dangerous for the time being, is socialistic radicalism. There are many vague socialistic aspirations and ideas which are quite admirable in the abstract, but they are far removed from practical programs. A common characteristic of socialistic agitation is individual and class selfishness, although it usually takes the form of altruistic formulæ. We may sympathize with socialistic criticism of the wage system, and may agree that the wage system is wage slavery. We may approve socialistic condemnation of the abuses of private ownership. We may admit that public ownership of public utilities is right in principle; and we may even suspect that the land question and the taxation of land values might after all be the fundamental social problem. But we remember that the present organization of society and of industry has a historic background and that it is a social order, highly complicated and highly developed, highly co-operative and highly altruistic. The question we raise is, would any socialistic program so far put forth, if adopted, bring about

an improved order? In view of this question, we should at least be moderate socialists and not radicals. The single tax proposal is probably just and workable, that is, economically sound; experience is testing it. We will certainly have a lesson in government control, if not government ownership, of public utilities, before the war is over, but it would be a gratuitous reflection upon the intelligence and moral capacity of a democratic people to assume or declare that the war was needed for this purpose. Profit sharing may to some extent mitigate the slavery of the wage system.

These are lines and directions of promising reconstructive effort. But the radicals are not satisfied with cautious and tentative procedure; they want revolution. The Industrial Workers of the World want to dispossess by force, if necessary, the proprietors of industrial establishments. Other radical socialists want to take over the ownership and operation of all public utilities and all governmental functions. This would mean complete and for the most part blind revolution. It would overthrow existing institutions and put nothing but the motives of individual and class selfishness in the place of them, with the probable result of anarchy and destruction.

But the destruction threatened by socialistic radicalism is not so utterly subversive as that threatened by some other forms. It is true that all types of radicals congregate in the socialistic body and march in the socialistic ranks, but there are certain types which constitute very large and independent groups and among these the modernists and the feminists are the most conspicuous and the most ominous; their radicalism strikes at the innermost vitals of our Christian civilization. The essence of Christianity is self-surrender, surrender to the law of love, which has its source in the Christian Lord who is Divine Love. The essence of modernistic radicalism is self-assertion and the denial that love has its source outside of the individual or social self, a denial that the Lord is God and that the Bible is His Word. When natural science radicals, ethical culture radicals, unitarian radicals, and philosophic radicals

succeed in persuading the common people that the Jesus they worship is not God but a mere man, and that the Bible is not God's Word, all belief in God and in Divine law will be swept away, the springs of self-love and the winds of self-assertion will be let loose, and the foundations of Christian civilization will crumble.

Equally undermining is the destruction threatened by feministic radicalism. Here too self-assertion and essential denial of the Christian religion are the primal forces of revolution, a disease at the core of civilization, a noxious breath infecting the inner shrine of society's temple, domestic life and the marriage tie. It is in the marriage union of two human souls that God's love and wisdom operate most directly and most sensibly. It is in the institution of marriage and the home that all the ends of human life are vitalized and sustained. The destruction or perversion of marriage, therefore, demolishes the innermost structure of society. Without marriage and homes there could be neither patriotism nor country.

With feministic radicalism the self-assertive interests of the individual are supreme. It is the prime function of the individual to live his own life unhindered and unhampered. In this spirit, feminism is a revolt against the restrictions, the restraints, and the compulsions of the marriage relation. Accordingly radical feminists would abolish the institution of marriage, remove all religious and conventional restraints upon sexual intercourse, and all moral restraints except the autonomous will and pleasure of the individual; they would make divorce subject to the will of either party; they would abolish the home and substitute communal nurseries and kitchens. Altogether the results would be worse than Plato's scheme of communal child-breeding.

No doubt there are difficulties inherent in the institution of marriage, in the marriage relation itself — and in the home. It may be that the difficulties are mainly due to the weakness, the ignorance, and the perversity of men and women. Probably some reconstruction is needed to make the conditions of married life freer and more expressive of

the ends and purposes of marriage. The fact remains that marriage is not a merely personal matter, but a religious and social institution, and it cannot be removed from this context without destruction, and with its destruction all social order and civilization must perish.

Before concluding, we advert to radicalism in education. In the perennial anti-classical crusade, in vocational education, in technical education and education in the special sciences, there is a narrowness of view and an extreme tendency to mechanical efficiency, that threaten the educational structure of ages. The ends of liberal education are lost sight of, and a blind demand for the practical is substituted. Reconstruction in education is inevitable in view of the immense changes now going on in the world's life, but the principles of the reconstruction must come not from radicalism, but from a true Christian religion, from a larger view of human life, and especially from a fuller knowledge of the nature of marriage and the social order.

Education — broader, higher, and more complete education of body and soul — is the solution of the world problem. Education is the cure for radicalism. Education is the light and guide of reconstruction. Education must save the world from the chaos and conflict of interests and social forces which the upheavals consequent upon this war will precipitate. But education must be more spiritual, more human; it must be modeled upon the education revealed to us in the story of the Lord's *glorification*.

In the coming world-struggle between the organized forces of plutocracy supported by militaristic and governmental concentration on the one hand, and the democratic masses on the other, Swedenborg's doctrine of the *Grand Man* must be urged and adopted as the social and political ideal. On this model the life of humanity, individual and collective, must be reconstructed. Then the Holy City, the New Jerusalem will be established upon the earth.

LEWIS F. HITE.

THE LUTHER QUADRICENTENARY

OCTOBER 31st, 1517, has been pronounced by the historian, James Anthony Froude, to be "the most memorable day in modern European history." As the four hundredth anniversary of that day is to be celebrated this month, it will be well for us to give some consideration to what it stands for, so that we too, if it seems well to us, may be mindful of that which is to be commemorated. For the most part the days that stand out in history are connected with great military events; but no battle was fought on that occasion. Not in national ways, but in religious and civic ways, was the day before us memorable. By general consent it has been called the birthday of the Reformation.

As things are not born without periods of preparation, it is of interest to note through the preceding generations the signs of the approaching event. General dissatisfaction with conditions economic, political, moral, and religious, kept manifesting itself in many ways; and though the fundamental principles of the prevailing religious belief were but little questioned, criticism of the Roman Catholic ecclesiasticism, which rested upon the nations like an incubus, was rife. Such criticism confined itself mainly to complaints against corruption in the Church and against the substitution of formalism in place of practical religion and vital piety. The discontent of temporal rulers because of the domination of the Church in civic as well as in ecclesiastical affairs was also natural enough. But Rome held the whip-hand raised over the world; and spiritual reformers such as Wyclif and Huss and Savonarola speedily felt in martyrdom her displeasure, while rebellious temporal rulers were often involved in punitive warfare from earthly princes more faithful to the Church. The transforming spirit, however, was permeating the mass of mankind more and more, and manifesting itself with some definiteness in certain general lines commonly designated by such names as "humanism," "mysticism," and "piet-

ism." These all tended to distinguish between the essential and the non-essential in religion; to insist upon the intimate relation between the individual soul and God, even to the denial of all mediatorial function to the Church and its priesthood; and to emphasize the authority of the Bible as supreme. These individualistic tendencies were further accentuated by the general influence of the Renaissance, which introduced a more pronouncedly naturalistic element than might otherwise have been evidenced. The recently invented art of printing too had placed in men's hands a new power for general enlightenment. A new intellectual ferment was everywhere at work in men's minds. There were numerous portents of coming events. Conditions became not unlike that of a supersaturated solution, needing but the addition of a single crystal to precipitate into visibility a large part of the discordant elements, thereafter to be augmented by steady accretions of favoring recruits, unless the drastic action of physical force, fire, and other agencies could again disrupt them all into invisibility. In the tide of European history that crystal was applied on Oct. 31, 1517; the formative forces of the Reformation were forthwith precipitated. A new epoch in the course of events was begun. Providentially matters progressed in ways that did not (as a century later, in the Thirty Years War) result in a challenge to arms, else the radical elements might have been successfully extirpated by the powers at the command of Rome; but on the contrary the movement grew rapidly and became too firmly rooted to be eradicated; and as it grew, the power of Rome declined.

This is not the place to deal in detail with the history of the Reformation Period at its inception. We are concerned here only with the central figure at this critical time in the course of civilization. "All human progress must remember Martin Luther," says Phillips Brooks; and as all other leaders of his day pale into comparative insignificance before him, and as he more than any other individual furnished not only the destructive ammunition used successfully against the corruptions and pretentions of

Rome, but also the constructive principles for the new order that was to succeed the old, it certainly behooves us to give some consideration to his life and thought.

Born at Eisleben, Saxony, on November 10th, 1483, Martin Luther was the eldest child of a poor miner, whose persistent ambition for his first-born led him to provide for his favorite son the best education the neighborhood afforded. This was probably meagre enough, though it led in due time to the University of Erfurt, from which, in his twenty-second year he received his master's degree, entitling him to teach in the University. His father's desire that he should become a lawyer led to initial steps to this end; but already the prevailing conception of life taught by the Church of his day had practically convinced him that the chief interest for any man regardful of his immortal destiny, was to devote himself to the pursuit of salvation in the conventional monastic fashion. A hasty vow made during the momentary terror resulting from a narrow escape from lightning during a frightful thunderstorm, led him to enter the Augustinian convent at Erfurt in the summer of 1505. After his novitiate he took his monastic vows early in May, 1507. The next decade was a period of earnest study and conscientious monkish observance. In 1508 his scholarship received recognition by an appointment to the chair of philosophy in the recently established University of Wittenberg, the capital of the old electorate of Saxony. Other scholastic honors followed, until in Oct., 1512, he received the degree of Doctor of Theology, involving an office in connection with which he pledged himself "to teach purely and sincerely according to the Scriptures." His labors were thus transferred from philosophy to theology; and he subsequently lectured much upon the Bible. Next to the Bible he valued Augustine. Incidentally he became acquainted with German mysticism; and these later interests tended to free him from the influence of Aristotle and scholasticism.

These years were most favorable to the development of his mind in ways that prepared him for the work that all unsuspected lay before him. Some of his own manuscripts

of lectures delivered during this period, and several sets of lecture notes taken by his pupils, have come to light during the last half-century, furnishing clear evidence that the young monk was already manifesting independent traits of mind, and that while loyal to the Church, he saw many things to criticise. No one, however, knew at this time what he was capable of; none could suspect what was in store for him. He would have been thunderstruck and perhaps terrorized could he have foreseen what the step he was soon to take in the hope of restricting the abominable traffic in indulgences would lead to. That "sacred business" had been invented by the Church at the time of the crusades as a means of promoting enlistments and contributions for those wars; and thereafter it had undergone the transformation necessary to make it a permanent source of revenue for the papal coffers. For a price the Church would exonerate any one from sin and the spiritual penalties of sin; with sufficient money one might purchase from the Church exemption from all the pains of purgatory, no matter what his crimes, — nay, might for a little filthy lucre free even the souls of his ancestors from further purgatorial suffering. In the development of this lucrative traffic the Church even went so far as to award an agency on a commission basis to a certain banking firm, and it made a wholesale contract with a certain temporal ruler in Germany when he was purchasing a bishopric. No wonder that criticism was rife, and that the sale of indulgences was forbidden in their domains by some electors! Such a ruling applied to the immediate vicinity of Wittenberg; but the reprobate monk Tetzel came to the outskirts of the restricted region, and carried on a profitable sale to such as resorted to him. Luther did what he could to discourage his town-folk from having anything to do with the devilish merchandise; but not with entire success. Since no general principles with regard to the worth of these fictitious deeds of exemption had ever been laid down by the Church, — since no rulings had been made, it was a matter that well might be debated by churchmen. And to the end of instituting such a debate, Martin Luther, on

Oct. 31st, 1517, affixed to the door of the castle church in Wittenberg a series of ninety-five theses which he proposed to maintain in criticism of the worth of indulgences. Unwittingly by that act he gave birth to the Reformation.

That paper was like a spark to tinder. Interested persons at once had the theses printed, and scattered to the four winds; and within a fortnight they had spread throughout Germany. Immediately Luther was known everywhere; no longer could he remain in obscurity; forthwith he became the central figure of the age in spite of himself. Fortunately for the world he was of sufficient genius to rise to the occasion, and to adapt himself to be the intellectual leader of the movement thus set afoot. Rome at once rumbled threateningly against him. His Scriptural and common sense arguments against indulgences were rejected; the papal bull of the following year "claimed for the pope the power of delivering sinners from punishments due to every sort of transgression"; for had not the Church an infinite credit balance of the good works of Christ and the saints to draw upon?

Needless here to dwell upon the successive steps leading up to the diet at Worms in April, 1521, — an event which has been called "the most splendid scene in history," — on which occasion Luther was practically forced to decide between allegiance to the Scriptures and passive obedience to a Church he knew to be corrupt. Then it was that he took his noble and heroic stand, uttering in substance the memorable words, "Unless convinced by the testimony of Scripture, I neither can nor will recant anything. Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise. God help me! Amen." He knew well enough that in giving expression to those words he was pronouncing his own death sentence. Fortunately for the world some of his friends immediately thereafter spirited him away and kept him in concealment for a while; but the pope's excommunication and the ban of the Empire made him thenceforth an outlaw; and not until conditions again became safe did he venture forth into the world. Meantime, disguised as a knight in the castle of the Wartburg, he devoted himself to translating the New

Testament directly from the Greek into the language of the people; and soon thereafter he conferred that priceless blessing upon the world by its publication.

In a few brief years the current started by his ninety-five theses had become a surging stream of transformation, of which he was recognized as the directing power. His fertile mind was just the type needed for this important function. Questions arose on every hand; were promptly submitted to him; and he forthwith poured forth treatise after treatise, settling many important points in ways that satisfied earnest men.* In the main his own thinking was eminently sane; and it speedily cleared up in others' minds the turgidity due to the foulness of the Roman Catholic atmosphere. Henceforth to the end of his life in 1546 he was mainly a preacher and controversialist. No detailed treatise on theology came forth from his pen, for he had neither time nor inclination to formulate a system of doctrine. His doctrinal foundation was still in the main that of his Roman Catholic training. A trinity of Persons in the Godhead, original sin, imputation of the merit of Christ, and justification by faith, were all retained. But by declaring that faith alone was sufficient for justification, and that good-works were in no wise essential, he departed from the Roman Catholic teaching, and enunciated that principle which promptly became the foundation tenet of Protestantism. Good-works, meritorious works, were such an integral part of the Roman Catholic system, that Luther saw in this new principle the lever with which to break away effectually from the dominance of Rome. He used it successfully to that end.

We believe it can truthfully be said that Luther was too honest a man to have made use of this heretical principle if he had not been intellectually convinced of its truth. Not that he did not have much to say in favor of good-works; but to him they were merely the evidence of the possession of the faith that is saving. He who possesses that faith does his good-works as a passive subject of God's grace, and not through activity of his own will.

* The works published by him number more than 400.

The problem thus becomes transformed into that difficult one concerning the freedom of the will; and on this subject Luther shows himself to have been a necessitarian, so far as spiritual Christian living is concerned. The soul that is saved is a passive doer of good-works. Salvation is by faith; good-works are an accompaniment of saving faith, but have no integral connection with it so far as activity on the part of the subject is concerned; in other words, faith and good-works are spiritually independent.*

This vicious doctrine seems to have been formulated by Luther as a resultant of his "will to believe." Its origin can with some certainty be traced back to his personal experience in the early years of his monastic life, when he was about thirty. He had entered the convent in search of salvation; but years of conscientious observance of all monastic practices had brought him no peace of soul. Holding in his mind's eye the traditional view of an omnipotent and arbitrary God who damned or saved souls as He pleased, he had devoted himself to the customary practice of endeavoring to win the favor of his God by earning "grace" through the faithful performance of works which the Church taught to be meritorious. At this period he firmly believed that in order to take place the impartation of "grace" must first of all be deserved. In the endeavor to deserve it, he reduced himself to skin and bones by exacting practices. Still there was no peace; and peace seemed to him essential, since he was unable to answer the question how any individual could become absolutely certain of the forgiveness of his sins and the impartation of God's "grace" except by a testifying peace of soul that was assumed to follow that experience. Somehow or other during this unhappy period his attention

* The following sentences showing that faith and good-works are not independent of each other, contains a sufficiently trenchant criticism of the Protestant conception of salvation by faith alone:

"The only faith that endures is that which springs from heavenly love. Any other faith than this is only knowledge or persuasion. Mere belief in truth and in the Word is not faith. Faith consists in loving truth and in willing and acting according to its dictates from inward affection." (Heaven and Hell, n. 482.)

was called to certain Scriptural passages, of which the following was to him of momentous importance:

> For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, the just shall live by faith. (Romans, i, 17.)

Thereafter, while meditating upon "the righteousness of God" and upon the statement "the just shall live by faith," the idea came to him, that to humble submission to the will of God must be added a glad trust in His mercy; and this was followed by the conclusion that it is impossible to trust implicitly in God without at the same time being certain of salvation and eternal bliss. Through the "will to believe," the certainty of personal salvation seems soon to have become a matter of indubitable conviction with him, a definite psychologic state, which he naturally cherished, emphasized, and maintained. The conclusion that monastic practices were of no importance to the end of salvation was an inevitable corollary. And with such meritorious works went the meritorious value of other good-works as well. Thus was born in his own mind the conviction of justification by faith alone, without the works of the law.

But Luther's heart was better than his head in this respect; indeed, although he convinced himself intellectually of the truth of his solifidian doctrine, and although he labored repeatedly and successfully to convince others of its truth, the goodness of his own heart and the "remains" of his childhood training, finally led him in the spiritual world (Swedenborg tells us) to see that he had been in error in this respect; and at last, though with great difficulty and much suffering, he rejected his favorite doctrine, and was eventually "translated among the happy of the New Heavens" (True Christian Religion, n. 137). Elsewhere Swedenborg reports that he once heard Luther say (this too was in the world of spirits):

> Do not wonder that I seized upon faith alone as justifying, excluding charity from its spiritual essence, also taking away from men all free-will in things spiritual, and holding many other things that depend on faith alone once accepted, as links on a chain, because my end was to break away from Roman Catholics, and this end I could not otherwise

follow and attain. I therefore do not wonder that I erred; but I do wonder that one crazy man could make so many others crazy . . . because they did not see in the Sacred Scriptures what is on the other side, which nevertheless is very manifest. (True Christian Religion, n. 796.)

From the detailed teachings of Swedenborg with regard to the perniciousness of the solifidian doctrine, and how it finally led to the spiritual end of the first Christian Church, we as New-Churchmen can hardly rejoice in that development of Christianity which led from Catholicism merely to Protestantism, except as we see that in the Providence of the Lord it was a necessary step to the culmination of the spiritual epoch then drawing to its close, and to the ushering in of a New Age. But we can freely rejoice on account of certain beneficent results that sprang from the Reformation, and that to a greater or less degree may be attributed to Luther. Next in importance to his work in throwing off the spiritual fetters of Rome, was his work in giving the Bible to the German people. Having translated the New Testament into the vernacular during his retirement at the Wartburg, he subsequently translated the Old Testament, and published the whole Bible in final revision in 1541. Heine said that by it Luther "created the German language." Given to the world nearly three-quarters of a century before the King James Version in England, it has doubtless done even more for the German language than the latter version has done for the English. But apart from any merely temporal advantage, the Word of God was a priceless gift to that nation from a spiritual standpoint.

In addition to his influence in breaking the Roman shackles, and his direct work in giving the Bible to the people, Luther did much to elevate the idea of marriage, previously held in very low esteem. When he had broken with Rome, he felt himself freed from all his monastic vows; and after openly advocating the marriage of the clergy, he soon acted on his own advice by taking to himself a wife (1525), the alliance apparently proving a very happy one on both sides. A writer of his own day,

Erasmus Alberus (1550), testifies as follows to the beneficent influence of the great Reformer in this respect:

> If Luther had accomplished nothing more with his teachings than that he again brought married life to recognition, he would have accomplished enough to be worthy of all honors. From him we learned that, whether there be joy or sorrow in married life, we have God's word, and know that He is pleased with such institution.

Other notable effects that have been attributed largely to Luther's teachings are the democratic principles of the separation of church and state; the right of individual judgment; freedom of speech and of the press; the extension and development of public education. As to the last mentioned, it is certain that from his time schooling began to improve, so that Meyer Prinzhorn has said (*Luther's Gedanken uber Erziehung*, p. 38):

> An impartial investigation of history will always again arrive at the conclusion that the German common school is a product of the Reformation, and that Luther must be called the founder of the common school.

In comment on this statement, Rev. O. H. Pannkoke (to whom we are indebted for the reference) has recently said:

> That conclusion is based on the very essence of Protestantism. In demanding direct and immediate communion with God, it has to insist on sufficient general education to read and understand the Bible. The responsibility was placed upon the individual, and he could not meet that without proper ability, which could come alone through education.

The need of common school education for the preservation of democratic principles, as well as for the spiritual development of the race, should also be borne in mind in this connection. In short, whatever perversions may have sprung out of the Reformation and affected the spirituality of individuals and even of certain nations,*

* A general belief in the doctrine of salvation by faith regardless of good-works, plus a liberal admixture of atheistic naturalism on shallow philosophic grounds, all combined with national conceit and aggressiveness, has been viewed by some thinkers as the predisposing condition that led to the present war; which has consequently been said to be a natural outcome of the "faith alone" doctrine, and evidence of a prevailing spiritual condition in the nation that caused it.

it may well be maintained that, from the standpoint of the general advance in civilization and in social regeneration, the world owes a great debt to Luther.

We have dealt with our subject in as favorable a light as possible, not unmindful of Swedenborg's teachings with regard to both Roman Catholic and Reformed Churches, but wishing to see the beneficent action of Divine Providence even in those black days, and to lay stress now upon such manifest good as has resulted in our time. We have tried to show that there are many things for which we can feel some indebtedness to Luther. While Protestantism as a whole still exalts his pernicious solifidian doctrine, and pronounces it his chief contribution to human welfare, we may for a time overlook this grievous defect in his teachings and be thankful for all that was sane and sound in them. Luther was unquestionably a great man; that he was also at heart a good man is evidenced by what Swedenborg reports concerning his final destiny.

Let us not be unmindful too of the fact that Swedenborg was himself the son of a Lutheran bishop; that he was baptised into the Swedish Lutheran Church; that he never withdrew from that body; and that on his deathbed he partook of the sacrament as administered by the pastor of the Swedish Lutheran Church in London. In fact, may we not in a way consider Luther and the Reformation as necessary precursors to Swedenborg and his mission? Let us imagine for a moment that no Reformation had taken place. We have already alluded to the fact that there were potent political elements as well as religious ones active at that time in bringing about that upheaval; for the autocratic power of Rome was gaining ground all the while in civil affairs as well as in ecclesiastical, and but for the Reformation that power would have been extended more and more banefully over the world. Her opposition to allowing the people to have the Scriptures (an attitude that she has thought best to modify of more recent times) would have been maintained with the utmost vigor and cruelty. There would have been no freedom of the press, nor any other kind of freedom. Even

if Swedenborg had written his illumined works, there would have been no place like London or Amsterdam where he could have had them published; and even if he had managed in some way to get them into print, they would have been promptly confiscated, and in all probability he would himself have been subjected to a martyr's death. Indeed Luther and the Reformation were necessary precursors to the New Age in more ways then one.

We have seen that the principal vitalizing power that inspired that great transformation was the Word of the Lord; that the conspicuous reforming spirits for several generations before Luther's time, — a period when copies of the Scriptures were rare, and procurable only in manuscript except towards the end, and then only in languages unknown to the people, — were men who had made some study of them, had been deeply influenced by them, and had tried to promulgate some knowledge of them. It was Luther's own study of the Scriptures that prepared him to be the chief champion in the revolt against Rome; in his contentions with Rome he took his stand firmly on the New Testament. Knowing somewhat of the value of the Scriptures from his personal experience, he made it a chief concern of his life to give them to the people in the vernacular. Thus Wyclif and Tyndale in England, Luther in Germany, not to mention others, did their best to place in the hands of the people that which from a secular standpoint has been designated as the magna charta of all political and religious liberties, the Word of God. In this connection we find Swedenborg saying that

> The only cause why the Reformation was effected, was that the Word which lay buried might be restored to the world. For many centuries it had been in the world, but at last it was entombed by the Roman Catholics, and not a single truth of the Church could then be brought forth from it. The Lord thus could not become known, and the Pope was worshipped as God, in the Lord's place. But after the Word had been extricated from its tomb, the Lord could be made known, truth could be derived from it, and conjunction with heaven became a possibility. For this purpose the Lord raised up simultaneously so many men, by whom an onslaught was made. (Invitation to the New Church, n. 24.)

The accessibility of the Bible to the people at large was a necessary preparation for the New Age, of which Swedenborg was the divinely chosen revelator. Although the New Church as an organization has not become a numerically strong body since his day, nor has it done much towards multiplying Bibles as such, yet Bible Societies have been established in several nations since the middle of the eighteenth century, and many million copies of the Holy Word have been scattered throughout the nations of the earth by these agencies. Apart from the special demand for copies of the Bible and parts of the Bible for the soldiers in the trenches, we understand that the general demand for Bibles today is greater than ever before. Though current theology still rests upon an erroneous conception of the nature of God, the nature of the Trinity, the nature of the Atonement, etc., etc., yet by Bible distribution the world is being prepared for the eventual transformation in the Lord's good time of the foundations of religion into the truths of the New Age. As yet this New Age has hardly more than dawned. Justice and judgment in the world are still mainly visions of the future; but nevertheless we may cherish our faith that the Kingdom of God will some day be approximated on earth. Truly, in spite of all the errors of the Reformers (many of which have already been outlived), we of the present generation can be thankful to God for Luther and the Reformation; and we can pray to be imbued with the better part of his spirit for the further benefit of mankind. As we commemorate the great event, let us have the forward look as well as the backward; and let us be mindful of the slogan that has been adopted for the celebration now at hand:

"To celebrate the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, and to hasten the Transformation of the Twentieth."

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

THE ORIGIN OF EVIL

THE origin of evil was discussed very interestingly under the title "Hell and the Problem of Evil" in the April number of this REVIEW (pp. 284–8). The closing words of the article are: "It seems then that we must fall back on the principle of use and abuse . . . the problem of evil is a question of use and abuse. But this is a topic for independent treatment." They left upon my mind the impression that the author felt the "Problem" was still left somewhat in the air. It is a perennial subject and evidently to thinking minds seems a significant factor that may have a very important bearing upon the recognition of the true situation in the world's historic world-wide war as well as on the momentous settlement that must soon follow.

The author of the essay strikes a true note when considering the difficulty in the way of approaching the Problem of Evil as an abstraction. To the mind of this writer the allusion to the method in this manner does not go quite far enough to make a further way of consideration either evident or necessary. What is in my mind is this: that the Kantian conception of an abstraction should be held clearly in view to see its untenableness in its unreasonableness as it involves the "Problem of Evil."

I would call attention to the fact that the New Church has a new conception of the idea going with the word "abstraction," which is most important in connection with "evil," indeed with every concept that lies outside of the purely scientific field. It is therefore not a digression, but the laying of a foundation that prompts the preliminary consideration of an abstraction.

An Abstraction

Kant's treatment of an abstraction is, to deprive a concept of attributes until finally only one essential attribute is left, and that final attribute is his abstraction, his abstract idea. His method of abstraction appears most evident in the discussion of "Space" and "Time." His idea of "Space," for example, leads him to deprive any object occupying "Space" of its accidental attributes of color and material, of size and dimensions, until nothing but the idea of extent is left. Further than this thinking cannot go, he insists; therefore, space is extent. Thinking can go no further, is Kant's dictum.

Kant had evidently a definite system in mind, and therefore stopped his thinking where he wanted it to halt. It seems, however, perfectly clear that any simple mind might have answered the philosopher, "Why yes, dear Sir, I can go farther than that and say, for instance, of a lily, not only can I deprive it as an object of all the concepts you mention, but even all, and the last with them, by speaking of a lily I saw *last year*, which is more abstract than his extent, by being — extent and all — a mere imagination: is space then, rather than extent, a mere imagination?" The simple question follows: Does not all thinking and speaking resolve itself to imagination pure and simple? Does this sort of abstraction not lead to a vicious confusion?

Swedenborg does not do away with the idea, but constantly resorts to abstraction; but his use is entirely antipodal to Kant's. It is more proper, however, to say Kant's method is opposed to Swedenborg's. Kant read Swedenborg's works with great avidity, and he absorbed Swedenborg greedily. But Kant deliberately stopped in the world of phenomena when he came to build up his philosophical system. He saw Swedenborg's concept of an *ultimate*, he could comprehend and use it; but there his philosophical reasoning halted. "The Critique of Pure Reason" is the copy of Swedenborg's "Natural Ultimate"; further than that, philosophy of his thinking would not let him go.

And yet, he preserved a remnant of transcendentalism when he discussed Swedenborg's opening of a "second sight" as "Dreams of a Spirit-Seer." In the first part of that little work he apparently falls in perfectly with Swedenborg, assenting to the possibility of seeing spirits. In the second part he endeavors to overthrow the validity of the individual incidents ascribed to Swedenborg's experience. In assenting to the problem in the whole as possible, then denying, or mainly undermining the specific incidents, Kant is on the way to demolish his own concessions. His own friends have accused him of "absolute inconsistency."

This mode of thinking in limited fields, where it might seem Swedenborg has led to a *cul de sac*, should be most seriously considered by a New-Churchman — not with a view to "getting the better in the argument," but for the sake of seeing the true position and, at least for himself, gaining a means for keeping out of lapses into error.

Apply this to Swedenborg's method of *abstraction*, and then to the idea of evil.

Swedenborg's procedure in gaining abstract ideas is fundamentally different from Kant's. Instead of depriving an object of attributes, he insists on widening the concept, dropping what is accidental, in order to expand what is essential. In his process therefore Swedenborg comes to the most important fundamental principle: that every object in the visible universe is not to be reduced to Space and Time, but to "what is good" and "what is true" (*bonum* and *verum*). That is to say, every object is either a *good* object, or a *true* position. Any thinking mind can perceive at once the great difference that underlies this ever-present search of Swedenborg for the *good* and the *true*, and the Kantian space and time conception. It matters little *when* a deed was done, *where* it happened; but it is everlastingly important, whether the deed was *good*, and its motive *true*.

"Swedenborg's method" is quite falsely attributed to him. He disclaims it at every step. The only thing that is his in it, is the fact that he saw it, and deliberately

followed it; though again he comes back and says it was *given* him to see, with the freedom of choice to follow it. While not in so many words, his maturest study shows that he acted most fully up to this disclaiming anything of his teaching as his own, when he declares that it all came directly from the Lord. Lest we imagine his statement as something miraculous, unverifiably his own, he adds, the Lord gave him the light of this insight while reading the Scriptures. And lest we should still think it beyond human reach, Swedenborg shows how it came to him while reading the Scriptures, by writing out most painstakingly the "Arcana Cœlestia," and the "Apocalypsis Revelata." In these works Swedenborg has left a most livid track of his study of Genesis and Exodus of the Old, with that of the Book of Revelation in the New Testament. It is a study almost word by word in the original Hebrew of the one, and Greek of the other, with a painstaking effort to understand their use in every part of the Word. It is here he learnt to look, not for space and time, not for men and things as part of a physical universe, but for what is good and true in the largest realm where all are living — in the Lord's Kingdom.

In this process of abstraction good and true never become dissociated in that Kingdom, but they are the essential attributes of all persons and things there. Here evil is the opposite of good, and false the opposite of true. But they are in their final or essential perversion attributes of beings and states of life; there are only evil beings, and false states of life in the perversions of what is good, and what is true.

To allow oneself to think of the evil and the false as entities without their connection with men and acts, is to play with an imagination, and so simply delude oneself. To extend the conception of evil to the inclusion of all evil beings, and of false to all false motives and incentives, is to see hell for what it is, a fatal reality and not an imagination, — a realm to which every evil-minded man and woman becomes allied and consociated through acts.

The Origin of Evil

Granted, then, that evil is the state of a human being or act, the origin of evil will have to be sought in man or mankind, of whom it is a state, or a quality. Ultimately there are but two states to which all human states can be reduced; the quality of man is either good or evil.

But where is that mysterious dividing line between good and evil? The author of "Hell and the Problem of Evil" would "fall back on the principle of use and abuse, and say that any experience, pleasurable or otherwise, is good when properly used, and bad when abused." Has he really put into the hand of a seriously struggling mortal the help that will infallibly lead him to know whether any experience should be indulged by him or not? Will not a seeker after truth, and a weak one at that, reaching for help, still ask for a better definition of "a proper use" and the "abuse" which qualify a being or act as good or evil? If "good" and "evil" are states or qualities of a human being or his acts, then good or evil are in him as a living being, or about him where his acts are manifested. In either case the good or evil is in him, or propagated from him; and his own good or evil state is his own quality, and proceeds from him as a good or evil act.

Now just what is it that is in him which is the good or evil quality?

Perhaps this can most easily be seen when man is regarded as man in the world and of the world. This means that he is a sentient being, for the senses connect him indissolubly with this world. Now every sense is endowed with the faculty of enjoyment. Satisfaction is the legitimate partner of hunger — and there is hunger of very many kinds; but the pleasure accompanying any satisfaction is not merely equally justified as the function which calls for it; but it comes, whether sought or unsought. The pleasure of taste in satisfying hunger and thirst is present with the act of satisfying the want. This applies to every sense. It is a universal law that function begets want, and the satisfaction of want as universally has its

delight; and pleasure in the delight of enjoyment where a want is filled is the just reward of function and use.

As the senses are the region where excess or abuse shows its weakening effects, we may ask, where is the limit of use or abuse in the sight or hearing, in the smell or tasting, or in the universal sense of touch in which, when manhood and womanhood is reached, the sense of all delights is gathered? Have we any means of determining the limit that makes any sense enjoyment good or evil?

Let us make sure of two things: first of all, what sense is in the true conception of sight, hearing, smell, taste, or touch; next in order, what pleasure is that gratifies any sense? In the last analysis the answer to the two will be one: when I awake to the consciousness of any sense, I simply know that I have an eye and can see, an ear and can hear, a nose and can smell, a tongue and can taste, and a delicate skin that is keenly alive to touch. In like manner I am conscious of the pleasure in the gratification of each function: I have a sense-life; I have a sense-pleasure.

What does this consciousness of sense-faculty and sense-pleasure mean? Is there any thing more to be said about it? Many stop here; but not the thoughtful man. He says the finding of faculty-organ, and of pleasure as its soul of use in exercising any function, is a witness that both organ and function with its pleasure come to me as a gift, indeed as a free gift, and as a generous gift. And who is the benevolent Giver? I am sure I should not know, unless the Scripture said that God formed the eye of man because He sees, fashions the ear because He hears, and all the rest. If God is the Creator of all the organs in man and their functions, He too is the Author and Source of the pleasure that crowns the exercise of any function.

I suppose if we did not have the picture of the infantile Church and Paradise, we should search for further light in vain. But the Paradise-state when man "walked with God," and the Paradise-state when man began to "talk with the Serpent," tell us exactly where the danger-line is marked. In their happy infantile state the consciousness

of a faculty, function and its enjoyment, was not a consciousness in the faculty, function or enjoyment of its gratification, but a consciousness of the Lord's presence wherever the faculty brought awareness of His gift. So long as the sunshine was the gift of God, or the beauty of Eve His gracious gift, so long the eye remained single; and so the enjoyment of natural heat and light, the delight of the partner's companionship, were innocent, clean and pure. Is it not true to this day, this hour, "the fear of the Lord," i. e., not a fear that is afraid of Him, but a fear of one's forgetting the Lord, — "the fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever" (Psalm xix, 9)? It makes "clean hands and a pure heart" (xxiv, 4). It helps man pray "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." And all this because faculty and sense-organizations are used as the Lord's, used with Him, sought and consciously desired as present.

But how different when affection, the human affection for practical knowledge, talks with the Serpent — for there is not even a Paradise-state without the presence of the Serpent; how different the human state of life! The Serpent does not know God; it does not know the death that would follow the disobedience to God's counsel, "You will not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." The Serpent did not know, because its knowledge reaches only down, not up. The affection for practical knowledge, the wife of Adam, this great, universal human affection, when sitting down alone to chat with the life that looks down, and its experience among natural things, does not consider why the knowledge of good and evil should not be among the human experiences, much less be there as the first and foremost knowledge.

Alas for the state of life that does not know that "none is good, save the one God!" What seems good without Him, is not good but evil; and evil in man is death.

Without the Scripture parable we should not know that the innocent life in Paradise was innocent, because when any sense was awakened it exercised every faculty by first looking to the Lord, first remembering that the life and

activity in the sense was the Lord's gift, yea, in a true sense, was the Lord within the human being as life. Then when consciously and conscientiously with the Lord, the stimulus in the sense activity was attended to, and the human response, with the Lord, was only good.

Is not here the crux, is not here the answer with every one who is in doubt as to any human use or abuse — which in the last analysis is a sense activity into which the whole life of a human being enters? That activity will unfailingly be good, if after first looking to the Lord, it be entered into with Him. That, forever is *use;* with the Lord in the act, there never is *abuse!*

I know, a wise life which is full of experience will say, "Do you mean to affirm that a human life thus lived will be perfect, and without any serious blunders or mistakes?"

Right here it is probably fair to say, that such a doubting question is the evidence that New-Churchmen are not taking their religion seriously. There ought not to be a vestige of doubt as to what the result of a Christian life lived with all sincerity in the Lord's sight, would be. "My yoke is easy": with Him, sharing the labor and toil of life, what otherwise might seem oppressive and almost unbearable, takes on a face of kindness, of ease; and anything borne in this way with Him is put upon a "light" shoulder.

Burdens there are in any life; toil there is a-plenty. We may even blunder seriously in spite of going to the Lord and taking Him consciously into our confidence before entering upon the toiling and burden-bearing. But this is sure: that even failures do not assume the aspect of hopelessness, but rather of partial success, because they lead to finding the causes of failure, and encourage to better effort — a promise of success.

Thus with the Lord consciously sought, there is no failure in a human life — even the things that men may call evil turn into stepping-stones upward. So the messenger to the gentiles thought when he wrote to the Romans: "We know that all things work together for good to them that love God" (viii, 27).

JACOB EMANUEL WERREN.

CURRENT LITERATURE

"BELIEF IN GOD AND IMMORTALITY"*

THIS book is sad reading. Its dead level of anthropological gossip and its statistical report of the religious poverty of considerable groups of college people, teachers and students, would be disheartening to the reader were it not apparent that the method is superficial and the field of view contracted. But even so, we have material here for sober reflection, and therefore we must attempt to give briefly some idea of the contents.

The first half of the book is devoted to a discussion of belief in immortality. Two forms of this belief are distinguished, the "Primary" and the "Modern." The former is identified for the most part with belief in ghosts, said to be propitiatory in character.

Emphasis is placed upon cases where the surviving personality is thought of as mischievous and hostile. On his own showing, however, the author lets it appear that there are also friendly ghosts, and these may well be the originals. In any case, the fact of primitive belief in ghosts, — that is, in personal survival after death, — is more important than the scientist's classifications and theories as to its origin and significance. The subject is a large and complicated one, and has important bearing on the natural history of religion, and especially of revelation.

"The Modern Belief" in immortality is, according to the author, an ethical product, the demand that the purpose of life shall be fully accomplished; and as this is never or rarely done in this life, it must be in the next, in the life hereafter.

* *The Belief in God and Immortality;* a psychological, anthropological and statistical study. By JAMES H. LEUBA, Professor of Psychology and Pedagogy in Bryn Mawr College. Boston: Sherman, French & Co. 1916. 340 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $2.00 net.

As a matter of fact, there is no clearly marked distinction between the "Primary" and the "Modern" belief. After all the author's labor, attention to the substantial features of the case shows the distinction to be in the main arbitrary. The fact remains that belief in survival after death is continuous from earliest recorded history. Ideas and motives have changed with the growth of ideas and motives in general. The ethical motive and ground of the belief is only a relatively late development.

The author makes considerable effort to discredit "proofs of immortality." He recites the various forms of evidence and the usual arguments for the belief. But here again the fact of the belief is of more importance than the explanations which are meant to discredit it. We may concede with reasonable satisfaction that there is more or less truth in the evidences and arguments, and still give more weight to the fact than to the arguments. No doubt the belief has been sustained down through the ages by a constant stream of witnesses, and these have enlarged the body of the belief.

Of all such witnesses, Swedenborg is the most substantial and the most complete. His may be said to be the first and the only genuinely expert testimony. As evidence of the narrowness of the author's treatment, it is noticeable that he does not mention Swedenborg; and yet Swedenborg's character and competence have never been impeached.

It is interesting at this point to compare the discussions of this book with those of the late Richard Wilde Micou* in his scholarly work, "Basic Ideas of Religion," which was reviewed in our January number. Dr. Micou in an affirmative spirit surveys the history of the discussion, and rests his case on the universal prevalence of the belief and its co-implication with the consciousness of spiritual personality. He strengthens confidence in the belief by appealing to the witness of conscience, and to the intuition

* Through a very regrettable mistake, this name was written Macon in the review above referred to. We take this occasion to make the correction and to offer our most humble apology. — *Editors.*

of the poets. He then takes up the various forms of denial and points out the insufficiency of their grounds. It is easy to insist that this is not logical proof, and not demonstrative evidence; but it is well to remind ourselves that logical proofs depend upon simplification and abstraction, while beliefs depend upon very complicated concrete conditions.

It is therefore impertinent to ask for proof in this case, as it is in the case of the belief in the existence of God. We may, however, as in any practical matter, consider the weight of the evidence. And here, as Dr. Micou shows, the evidence is cumulative. We may then dismiss the historical and argumentative material of the first part of the book before us which is concerned with the belief in immortality, and pass on to the statistical half. The results here are naturally definite and positive.

The object of this investigation was to determine by the statistical method what proportion of college students and scientists believe in God and immortality.

Answers were obtained from about one thousand students, of both sexes. As another group, one thousand scientists were interrogated. Several special groups of scientists were separately questioned; namely, three hundred and seventy-five historians, professors of history in colleges and universities; one hundred and ninety-seven sociologists; and one hundred and seven psychologists. The average result for all these classes is that only about fifty per cent believe in God. It is significant to observe the order of the percentages. For students it is ninety, historians forty-eight, sociologists forty-four, scientists in general forty-one, psychologists twenty-four. From this it appears that the study of science as it is now pursued in institutions of higher education is destructive of belief in God. This result is emphasized by a comparison of the lesser with the greater scientists. The average is twenty-five per cent for the greater, and forty-three for the lesser. This means that as a rule the more eminent a man becomes in science, the more apt he is to disbelieve in God. It appears that some sciences are more destructive of belief than others; and it is surprising that the physical sciences

are not so destructive as some others higher up in the scale of life. For example, among the physicists the percentage is forty-four, while among the biologists it is thirty. The psychologists are at the bottom of the list with a percentage of twenty-four. It is noticeable that the historians come highest with forty-eight, and the sociologists next with forty-six.

An ominous indication in the same general direction is that among the students the number of believers decreased as they passed into the higher classes. In the case of belief in immortality, the percentage was eighty for freshmen and sixty for juniors; but curiously it rises to seventy for seniors.

On the whole, the story is a serious impeachment of present-day higher scientific education. The New-Churchman may take some comfort in the fact that the kind of belief in God and immortality which scientific education tends to destroy, is not really a worthy belief, but rather a traditional superstition. Certainly one gets the impression from reading the specimens of answers quoted that the respondents have had almost no religious education. Their religious ideas are for the most part vague and confused. To us the book is an eloquent appeal for a distinctive New-Church education.

The author, who is an avowed infidel, and apparently an atheist, argues on the basis of his statistics that belief in God and immortality is disappearing *pari passu* with progress in education; and he goes further and attempts to show that these beliefs are really valueless for higher moral purposes.

His indictment of the belief in immortality amounts to the common assertion that mere continuance of life is in itself devoid of moral quality. The author's treatment of this subject is a good illustration of the meagreness of his religious education and the crudity of his religious views. It is obviously true that mere continuance of life has in and of itself no moral value, whether in this life or in the life to come.

But a little familiarity with Swedenborg's teaching

about spiritual life, and especially about heaven and hell in the other world, would disabuse the mind of any such meagre conception. In brief, the moral value of belief in immortality lies in the fact that all true spiritual life is a free development, and in heaven especially it is an endlessly free development in a perfectly adapted environment. Now the essence of moral life is free development in the direction of good; and this is just what immortality means for the truly educated Christian.

The idea of God is, according to the author, valueless for the reason that after all the worth of this idea comes from social products. In other words, all that is significant and efficacious in the belief in God is the outcome of social conditions, and the direct creation of the social spirit. This is in effect saying that men and society can get along just as well without God as with Him; or rather, according to Lucretius, very much better. To this, Christian experience and the religious history of mankind, sad as it is, is a sufficient answer. But the New-Church idea of God as Infinite Love and Wisdom lifts the moral and spiritual ideals of men to their highest powers; and the New-Church doctrine of the Divine Human makes God in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ actually and intimately present and operative. In this view belief in God is a practical matter, not a matter of abstract sentimental faith.

What Dr. Leuba needs, and what the subjects of his statistics need, is a better idea of God.

LEWIS F. HITE.

"POSITIVE PROTESTANTISM"*

IN his "Brief Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church," Swedenborg has given us a concise presentation of the fundamental doctrines of the Roman Catholic and

* *Positive Protestantism*; a concise statement of the historical origins, the positive affirmations, and the present position of Protestantism. By A. AUGUSTUS HOBSON, Ph.D. Philadelphia: The Griffith and Rowland Press. 1917. Text-book edition, 224 pp., 12mo. Cloth, 60 cents net. Complete edition, $1.00.

the Protestant Churches of his time, together with a criticism of those doctrines, and a setting forth of the actual truth involved in those matters as revealed for the New Church. The importance of presenting truth in contrast with falsity in this way was emphasized by him in a remarkable passage (Invitation to the New Church, n. 25) referring to his "Coronis," in which work — assuming it to have been fully written — he apparently set forth this contrast with regard to fundamentals at some length. We cannot but have extreme regret that only the early chapters of that work have come down to us.

The doctrinal position of the Roman Catholic Church was fundamentally unsound. The Protestant Church took over the fundamental doctrinal unsoundness bodily, and added further perversions of its own. The spiritual benefits conferred by its doctrines as such are therefore mainly negative. But that Protestantism has conferred some very positive benefits upon humanity, there are abundant proofs. Some of these benefits have been briefly mentioned in an editorial on "The Luther Quadricentenary" in this issue of the REVIEW; but if one wishes to see them set forth in considerable detail from the religious standpoint, we doubt if one can do better than to procure and read the recently published book entitled "Positive Protestantism; a Concise Statement of the Historical Origins, the Positive Affirmations, and the Present Position of Protestantism," by Rev. A. Augustus Hobson, Ph.D. It is full of interesting information contrasting the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Churches, greatly to the advantage of the latter. The treatment seems fair, and to an unbiassed mind wholly conclusive. With exception of "the central doctrine of Protestantism, salvation by faith" (p. 37), the fundamental doctrines so severely condemned by Swedenborg are no more than touched upon; but the subject of salvation is dealt with in two chapters — "Salvation: By Faith or Law?" and "Salvation: By Faith or Sacrament?" — that show Romanism in very disadvantageous contrast. But when we come to Dr. Hobson's summary statement concerning faith, we can well understand

why Protestantism has the advantage in the presentation. He says —

> Protestantism considers faith to be much more than an assent to dogmas. In the usage of the New Testament "faith" has an intellectual element, but the chief feature of it is volitional. Faith involves acting on the basis of what one believes to be true. . . . Faith is the attitude of the whole being toward God which, because of confidence in God and in the revelation of him in Christ, makes men willing to live for him. . . . Of such faith good works, according to Protestantism, are both the expression and the test. (P. 34.)

Unless the poison of volitional determinism is somewhere hidden inside, this is not Lutheranism, nor primitive Protestantism. In short, it tends to prompt in a New-Churchman a decidedly friendly feeling, so far as this special matter is concerned. Perhaps that is one reason why (since the fundamentals concerning the Trinity, the Atonement, etc., are not dwelt upon, nor much involved) a New-Churchman can read the book with pleasure and profit; for, while the New Church is not a denomination of the Protestant Church, it shares with Protestantism the general blessedness of being free from Roman Catholic domination, and this book makes clear some of the spiritual advantages involved in that freedom.

Turning to the Table of Contents, we find that, after an introductory chapter on Protestant Origins, the remainder of the volume is divided into two parts, the first dealing with Protestant Affirmations of Christian Truth, and the second with The Present Protestant Situation. In the first part, after a chapter devoted to Agreements and Disagreements [between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism], and the two chapters on Salvation, the following topics are taken up: The Church and the Ministry; Religious Authority; Faith the Sufficient Means of Grace [this in contrast with the Romanist contention that no soul outside her communion is saved]; Romanist Deformities; and Worship and Freedom [ecclestiastical and political, not volitional]. The second part consists of three chapters dealing respectively with the Divisions, the Unity, and the Prospects of Protestantism. In the first of these,

after he has dealt in a general way with the genealogical tree of the Christian sects in this country, he makes the following summary statement:

> It is plain, therefore, that instead of one hundred and fifty different denominations in this country, each with its separate way to God, there are really less than ten important divisions with distinctive and numerical significance, and even these are closely related in three or four streams determined by the course of development at the time of the Reformation. (P. 180.)

This is the chapter in which the author mentions (p. 178) the national organizations of the New Church, with a brief remark showing that he does not think they have "numerical significance."

In next to the last chapter Dr. Hobson calls attention to various evidences that the denominations are tending to lay less stress upon their doctrinal differences, and are tending to get together for Christian work. In this connection he makes special mention of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, involving the union for cooperative work of thirty denominations numbering seventeen and a half million communicants who believe "in Jesus Christ as their Divine Lord and Savior" (the sole doctrinal basis of this remarkable federation, to which our General Convention is seeking admission).

The final chapter contrasts the Prospects of Protestantism with those of Roman Catholicism, to the discomfiture of the latter. While Catholicism has been showing signs of aggression in some ways that seem to threaten the true welfare of human souls, Dr. Hobson gives evidence that its power is really decaying.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

"RATIONAL ORTHODOXY"*

"RATIONAL ORTHODOXY," a volume of essays on mooted questions, as its sub-title informs us, was written by

* *Rational Orthodoxy:* Essays on Mooted Questions. By a member of the Presbytery of New York. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1917. 565 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $1.50 net.

a member of the Presbytery of New York, who does not give us his name. The purpose of the book may be fairly stated in its declaration about one of the component essays: "an independent re-examination of Biblical teachings in the hope that it might contribute to that unity of faith which is greatly to be desired among Christians."

The authority on which the book builds is human reason. Its own declaration is:

> The believer weights the different teachings of the Scriptures, comparing them with each other and with the facts of his own experience; and so, not apart from his reason, but in the exercise of his reason, becomes fully settled in the faith of the Gospel. . . . We recognize the Scriptures as a reliable source of knowledge, while at the same time this knowledge and the certainty of it are to be ascribed not to any doctrine of infallibility, but to a right exercise of reason in considering the teachings of the Bible. . . . Man may be said to have two sources of religious knowledge, — one of these, the Scriptures (that is, revelation as received and interpreted by reason), and the other, reason as exercised independently; and it is evident from the nature of the case that these two methods must always harmonize. Truth can never conflict with truth, or knowledge with knowledge.

However, as we read on, we soon discover that that reason which stands as authority for the teachings of the book is the author's own reason, which is fully under the dominion of orthodoxy. Any conclusion of human reason in the field of theology or science which conflicts with that idol, Orthodoxy, is rejected as falling short of what is worthy to be called the final verdict of that one source of knowledge, reason. Yet the author says that the human mind in the use of its faculties, and quite independently of a supernatural revelation, can reach absolute and correct certitude regarding many facts and truths. He further declares that man can hope for increasing accuracy of knowledge only through the exercise of his reason. The evolutionists of a past generation, and the scientists and philosophers of today, are dismissed in a haze of doubt as to fact in their findings, which, if entered into, makes their conclusions of less than no value. The book should have been entitled "Orthodoxy," or "Logical Orthodoxy," but not "Rational Orthodoxy"; for the context does not

rise to the height of the present title. The author fails to see how the products of human reason, other than those which agree with his own, can be true.

This failure is fundamental. It is the stumbling block in the way of a self-derived faith in the Word that all Christians, and indeed all peoples, can unite in. Certainly any man has a right to consider different points of view, and to reject those that do not appeal to his rationality; but when it comes to a study of the Word of God, the need is not for increasing accuracy of human knowledge and the exercise of human reason to sit in judgment and declare its teachings. In the presence of the Word of God we stand upon holy ground. Our need there is for the voice out of the bush, the voice of God Himself. The New Church meets the difficulty with which Protestantism is confronted when the doctors disagree, by the statement that God has now given the world His own teachings by means of which human reason can now enter into the mysteries of faith. Here alone can the world find rational theology. Human reason must come to the judgment and acknowledge that revelation is something more than a product of its own right exercise.

It would be the height of unreason to expect an acknowledgment of the impotency of human reason to search out God from an author who defines revelation as the right exercise of human reason; who makes human reason the judge in considering the teachings of the Bible, and the Bible itself nothing more than a history of God's dealings with the human race. But the book in hand is so clear, and withal so interesting a statement of the position of the leaders of the Protestant church today (which has grown out of their historical position that the Bible is an infallible book, and that any rational human being can, by the exercise of his reason, find ground for absolute conviction regarding the fundamentals of Christianity, and this in the face of the fact that many men in the exercise of this theory have grown far away from the positions of Orthodoxy), that it seemed fair to state the theory of the New

Church in regard to the relation of human reason and the Bible.

The theology of the book is frankly the theology of Paul and the Apostles rather than of Christ and the four Gospels. As space does not permit a notice of all the essays, we may quote a few sentences from that on the Atonement. The author states that:

> Christian faith rests on Christ as a personal mediator between God and man. The Lordship of Jesus is subordinate to that of God His Father. A pre-existant Divine Personality was mysteriously united with the Christ of history. Christ dies for our sins in order that they might justly be forgiven. Modes of action may be right and permissible in the Divine Being which are not permissible to created agents. . . . God's thoughts are above our thoughts. . . . Human justice does not offer any precedent with which the atonement on the cross can be illustrated. . . . The explanation of Christ's atonement is that it was made by a Divine Being who had assumed our humanity, who had the right to give his life in vindication of Divine righteousness, and whose death entitled him to discharge the penalties required by his own government. Such a being, manifesting and carrying out his justice in this way, earned repentance, forgiveness, and eternal life for the sinners for whom he died. . . . It is enough to know that Christ died for our sins, and that in some way his death is the ground of our forgiveness. . . . As Adam acted for his children and furnished a ground for their condemnation, so Christ acted for believers and furnished a ground for their justification.

As a final illustration of the working of human reason aided only by the faith of Orthodoxy, we may quote briefly from what the author believes about the devil. He rejects the theory that the story of the Garden of Eden is a myth or an allegory, although both these theories are the product of that same human reason which he so exalts. He says,

> The incident described is such as may have taken place during the primitive life of Eden. It is not to be supposed, however, that the serpent spake as represented; but only appeared to do so. The voice was that of the Tempter, whom the woman did not distinguish from the animal of which he had taken possession. Indeed the whole narrative assumes what may be styled a temporary identity of Satan with the serpent. . . . From this account it is plain that Eve's Tempter cannot be identified with any weakness of her own nature, nor with any tendency of created beings to deviate from upright ways. He

was an external, personal, spiritual agent, who carried out a wicked plan and deserved punishment for so doing.

Milton tells this same story:

> The infernal serpent; he it was, whose guile
> Stirred up with envy and revenge, deceived
> The mother of mankind, what time his pride
> Had cast him out from heaven, with all his host
> Of rebel angels.

The whole collection of essays, in spite of a certain twentieth century flavor, takes us back to the days of Milton and the theology of "Paradise Lost." The Father on the Throne, the Eternal Son, the Holy Ghost are set forth as three personalities having each its distinct attributes and functions in the Godhead. Satan is there a separate God, a rival of the true God. We miss from this account none of the machinery of the great poem of Protestant theology.

We hear New-Church people say, "The old, man-made doctrines are no longer taught." Such persons should read this book wherein the old doctrines are ably taught and defended, and at points slightly revamped to meet the new light that is growing in the world. I should say that members of our Young People's League who are intending to make a study of Swedenborg's "Four Doctrines," would find this book profitable reading as a modern statement of doctrine that unintentionally furnishes evidence of humanity's need for teachings from the Lord Himself concerning the secret and hidden things that belong unto God, which human reason can enter only as God Himself reveals.

RUSSELL EATON.

"ASPECTS OF THE INFINITE MYSTERY"*

This is a book that may be read more than once with deep interest and profit, especially at this time when Mr. H. G. Wells in his recent book, "God, the Invisible King,"

* *Aspects of the Infinite Mystery.* By GEORGE A. GORDON. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1916. 356 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $1.50 net.

has failed to see how God can be infinite, and has raised the question in the minds of a great many readers. Mr. Gordon speaks of his own book, — published before that of Mr. Wells, and having no reference to it, — as being "somewhat of the nature of a confession of faith"; but it is a great deal more than this, for it is an able study of the Infinite in which all things finite "live and move and have their being." And it is a study of the Infinite in its various aspects in relation to the finite mind, as being within and above nature and spirit, and out of its own reality and worth giving reality and worth to them, and so expressing itself, and revealing itself with endless variety. Therefore it is not a study of Infinity as revealed in the Bible, but it is a study of the Infinite revealed in human experience, in which the Bible has its essential place. It is first of all the author's own experience with the Infinite which is set forth in his charming literary style, enriched by pleasing anecdotes; and then illustrations from poetic masterpieces are added to each chapter, or topic discussed, to show that his own is but a part of universal human experience. In this way he shows that the Infinite, in all its aspects, is always God; that the Good is always the path to God; that Personality belongs to Him; and Fatherhood; and that man is the Host of the Infinite. He goes on to discuss the Historic Reality of Jesus; Man and the Moral Ideal; the Reality of Inspiration; the Dualism in Man; Moral Evil and Racial Hope; the Mystery of Redemption; the Mystery of the End.

In these chapters Dr. Gordon establishes to the satisfaction of his own reason the great verities of life and of religion; and he succeeds in doing it, while avoiding all the technicalities of ordinary theologians and philosophers, in the plain language of everyday life. And it is difficult for the writer to see how any rational mind can fail to be satisfied. For example, in identifying the really good with God, he says:

> There is still another way, the greatest of all ways, I believe, of bringing to distinctness the consciousness of God. The good is the path to God. Here we must ask, What do we mean by the good?

The answer is in one word, satisfaction. For man, for rational being anywhere, beyond perfect satisfaction there is nothing. Truth is the satisfaction of the intellect; the intellect asks for nothing beyond that. This is the truth. The intellect replies, "I am satisfied." The æsthetic sense calls for beauty; and when beauty comes it is satisfied, it asks for nothing beyond. The conscience calls for right; and when right comes, the conscience is satisfied, and asks for nothing more. The heart cries out for love; and when that comes, the heart is satisfied. Truth is the satisfaction of the intellect; beauty is the satisfaction of the æsthetic sense; right is the satisfaction of the conscience; love is the satisfaction of the heart. All these satisfactions gather themselves into the Absolute satisfaction which is the Absolute good, the Absolute God: "I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness." (Pp. 30, 31.)

The reasoning about the Personality of God is equally simple and convincing. The body is not personality, but the instrument of it. Personality is in the mind that knows itself, remembers, views an end, has the power of devotion to that end, and the sense of a greatening moral experience. "Does God know that He is, and what He is? Are God and man so constituted that each can hear the other's call? If so, God is personal, and the only complete personality." But the author is obliged to admit that personality does limit God somewhat as Mr. Wells is urging. It at least "denies that God is everything; it relates Him to souls that He made and that are other than He. This sort of limitation is in the nature of things" (p. 60). But neither Mr. Wells nor Dr. Gordon seem to realize that this is a self-imposed limitation which only demonstrates the Divine Infinity that transcends these very limitations. God is therefore infinite in His power to bestow upon mankind all the good that they are willing to receive, and infinitely more, — and all the truth, and all the powers of service. And since, by Dr. Gordon's own conception and definition, personality is an attribute of Mind, the Divine Mind is infinite because man's failure to receive does not limit God's power to give. Because there is no limit to the Divine Love, the Divine Wisdom, and the Divine Life, — because it is self-existing, pure and perfect, and not received from nor dependent upon another, —

therefore Personality, the Divine Personality, does not "limit God somewhat"; it is Infinite in Itself.

Here both Dr. Gordon and Mr. Wells need Swedenborg's Doctrine of the Divine Humanity of Jesus Christ to clarify their thinking about the transcendence and the immanence of God. By the assumption of the human, God does descend into human relations with men which on the human side are limited by man's willingness and ability to receive, but which nevertheless on the Divine side are, within and above all these limitations, infinite still, eternal and absolute. If they only could grasp this great fundamental truth of the Christian religion, their difficulties about the Trinity would disappear, and with them the clouds of mystery, which now shroud so much of the spiritual and Divine from their eyes, would be dissipated; and Dr. Gordon would have chosen a different title for his book, for he would be entering into the light of the heavenly proclamation of the Lord's Second Coming, "*Nunc Licet*, Now it is permitted to enter rationally into the mysteries of the Christian faith." Still, there is much in his thinking that leads in this direction, and his suggestions are most interesting, and his style and illustrations delightful.

H. CLINTON HAY.

"THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION."*

IT is seldom that such clear-cut work in the psychology of religion is done by any writer as that of Professor Coe in his latest contribution to the subject. One knows precisely where to place the interpretation of religion running through the book; and because of its comprehensive studies in the whole field, one knows about how much has been accomplished. The work is typical of the modern critical spirit, which in thinking itself free from the old dogmas has thought away pretty nearly everything else too. To say this is not to over-

* *The Psychology of Religion.* By GEORGE ALBERT COE, Professor of Religious Education, Union Theological Seminary. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1916. 382 pp., 12 mo. Cloth, $1.50 net.

look the positive element of the book, for it is excellent as a study of social psychology, and is wholly free from the old-time subjectivism and individualism. The emphasis throughout is social; our sinfulness is regarded as "conjoint," and our salvation can be won only through some kind of social reconstruction which shall bring justice to all. Nothing further can be asked of the writer in this regard. But for him religion is little more than "an original grasp on life" which springs from an impulse to live a diversified life as well as one can. There is, he assures us, no religious instinct, and "no evidence that a religious intuition ever occurs." Wholly free from dogma, as he believes he is, he maintains that to believe in any inspired writer is to be dogmatic. He takes little interest in anything in religion savoring of mysticism, in any experience declared authoritative in contrast with psychological analysis.

To one who, like the reviewer, finds the essence of religion in experience and the living Word which interprets it, this is practically to omit religion altogether. The author's point of view leaves out the possibility that a comprehensive psychology of religion might grow out of a seer's experience which differs from that of the typical mystic. Swedenborg was neither a mystic nor a critical rationalist, but a seer whose rationalism grew out of a system of first principles disclosed to him and implying a profounder psychology than that held by Professor Coe. To accept this inner disclosure is not as Coe would say to be dogmatic, but to find it verifiable in religious experience on psychological grounds. For religion must have a cause adequate to produce it. We must start with the larger vision before we can interpret the much smaller matter, that is, man's attempt to analyze his experience, or his discovery of himself as a social being. The living Word, the same in the Bible, the Lord, the human soul experiencing and thinking today, yields the complete point of view. Then one may single out the psychology, for instance, from the "Arcana Cœlestia" and the "Divine Love and Wisdom," and proceed to develop one's special science. In this sense the psychology of religion is by no means new. It simply has not been singled out and made explicit. Here

is a great opportunity for some one who is prompted to put the teachings of Swedenborg in a new light. One might make such an exposition without entering into doctrinal matters to any extent; for Swedenborg's psychological principles may be put to the immediate test of experience and their power to explain religion today as essentially " social."

HORATIO W. DRESSER.

A REPLY TO SIR OLIVER LODGE'S " RAYMOND." *

THESE five discourses are on: I. Why believe in the Spiritual World? II. Can spirits communicate with men? III. Sir Oliver Lodge's Book " Raymond "; IV. Sir Oliver Lodge's Faith; and V. The Faith of the New Church.

The main argument presented for a belief in the spiritual world is, that in all ages and races there has been a universal belief in God and a spiritual world. Every man is in miniature a spiritual world and a natural world, for he is a spirit clothed with a body. Man can also come into relation with the Divine Being. God has revealed Himself to man; and He has also revealed the existence of the spiritual world, and that man lives therein after the death of the material body.

That there is a possibility of intercommunication between the spiritual and the natural worlds is proved by the appearance of angels and spirits to men, as recorded in the Scriptures of both Testaments. There were also laws forbidding seeking communication with the spiritual world through mediums. This form of spirit communication was and is disorderly, and it should be discouraged, because it brings evil spirits present who personate those whom one wishes to communicate with.

Sir Oliver Lodge's book " Raymond " gives evidence of the presence of spirits, but the communications from them are of a low order and trivial. Speaking of the group photograph of Raymond and his fellow officers, Mr. Schreck does not believe that the information concerning it came from Raymond.

* *A Rational Belief in Heaven;* A Reply to Sir Oliver Lodge's Book " Raymond." By the REV. E. J. E. SCHRECK. Birmingham: Cornish Brothers, Ltd., 1917. 37 pp., 12mo. Paper, 30 cents.

Contrasting the information coming through mediums with that revealed through Swedenborg, it is shown that Swedenborg reveals the spiritual truth of the Word and the life after death in a rational and clear manner. Swedenborg's teachings rest on the Word of the Lord. Since so much is said in the Bible concerning the other life, it must needs be that the Lord, in revealing the spiritual content of the Word, must also make known the facts and phenomena of that world and its relation to the natural world. This has been done through Swedenborg. On the other hand the communications through mediums are contradictory, trivial and unreliable.

Sir Oliver Lodge has faith in the mediumistic messages. He has a high motive to enlighten and comfort the bereaved; but he puts his faith in the unreliable communications through mediums. Even Sir Oliver himself says that such investigations should be carried out by trained investigators. In this connection Mr. Schreck quotes Swedenborg, thus showing that the spirits deceive and personate others, and that no reliable information about the other world can be obtained through mediumship.

In the closing lecture Mr. Schreck analyzes the teaching in Swedenborg's "Heaven and Hell" concerning the Lord as the God of heaven and earth, the Spiritual World, and the life after death, and shows that his teachings agree with the Word of the Lord.

We commend this little work as a useful presentation of the New-Church teachings of the life after death, in contrast with the spiritistic method of obtaining information about the other life.

JOHN WHITEHEAD.

"THE MEXICAN PROBLEM" *

MR. CLARENCE W. BARRON, one of the first financial authorities of this country, attested by the fact that he is at the head of the three foremost financial journals, the *Wall*

* *The Mexican Problem.* By CLARENCE W. BARRON. With introduction by Talcott Williams, LL.D. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1917. 136 pp., 12mo., illustrated. Cloth, $1.00 net.

Street Journal, *The Boston News Bureau* and the *Philadelphia News Bureau*, has written a very interesting book on Mexico in "The Mexican Problem," published by the Houghton Mifflin Company.

Mr. Barron is always entertaining, and he certainly holds one's close attention as he talks about Mexico and present conditions in that unhappy country. He also gives a great deal of valuable information in regard to the oil fields of Tampico, in the northeastern part of the Mexican Republic.

For any one interested in the Mexican problem Mr. Barron's book is well worth while. His views are necessarily colored by his financial environment and his temperament; but one can give no more than his personal viewpoint in his interpretations of events and conditions, and Mr. Barron's viewpoint happens to be world-wide in its scope and keen in its perception of values. He is well-informed, and his presentation of his facts and his views is clever and vivid.

WALTER B. MURRAY.

THE ROTCH EDITION OF

The Worship and Love of God

DESCRIBING

I. The Origin of the Earth, Paradise, and the Abode of Living Creatures; also the Birth, Infancy and Love of the First-born or Adam.

II. The Marriage of the First-born or Adam; and, in connection with it, the Soul, the Intellectual Mind, the State of Integrity, and the Image of God.

III. The Married Life of the First-born Pair.

By EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

A revised and completed translation (including the Third Part now first published and translated into English from the Latin manuscript of the author) by Alfred H. Stroh, A.M., and Frank Sewall, A.M., D.D.

It is a presentation in sublime poetic form of the philosophic doctrine of creation as given in Swedenborg's "Principia," but adds the entirely new description of the formation and birth of man, and also an epitome of the physiology and psychology of the works on the "Animal Kingdom."

It is a very engaging and fascinating introduction to Swedenborg's entire scientific and philosophic system.

300 pages, 5 x 7 1-4 inches, bound in cloth. Price, $1.00, postpaid.

Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 BOWDOIN STREET :: BOSTON, MASS. :

New Standard Edition of Swedenborg

An accurate and scholarly translation of the Latin of the theological works of Emanuel Swedenborg, being the same as that of the Library Edition, which sells for double the price given below, which is intended to place these wonderful Writings within the reach of all who may wish to have them on their shelves at home. Easily read Roman type, well printed on good paper and substantially bound in dark green cloth.

STANDARD EDITION	*Postpaid*
Arcana Coelestia, twelve volumes, each	$0.60
Apocalypse Revealed, two volumes, each	.60
Heaven and Hell	.60
The True Christian Religion, two volumes, each	.60
Conjugial Love	.60
Divine Love and Wisdom	.60
Divine Providence	.60
The Four Doctrines	.60
Miscellaneous Theological Works	.60
Apocalypse Explained, six volumes, each	.60

The American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society

Three West Twenty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.

Storage

THE

KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

AS SEEN BY

SWEDENBORG

By JOHN HOWARD SPALDING

"Ever since I became firmly convinced of the truth of Swedenborg's teaching, it has been my desire to present it in the simplest possible form; and this book is the result. . . . The aim . . . is to give a general idea of the main features of Swedenborg's teaching, so that a reader who wishes to go to the fountain-head for his information may have some outline of the system of thought propounded by him in his mind, into which he can fit the various particulars which he meets with in the course of his study. Swedenborg's works are often found difficult to understand because this kind of preparation has been neglected. . . .

"The mental attitude of one who has fully made up his mind with regard to any system of religious doctrine is apt, I think, to be rather unattractive to one who is still entangled in the mazes of doubt, for whose use especially this work is designed. "Ah!" he thinks, "this man has never felt *my* difficulties! It is all plain sailing to *him*." If this book has any value, it arises from the fact that the difficulties with which it deals are those through which the author himself had to fight his way during many years of study."

(*From the Author's Introduction, page 5.*)

348 pages, 12 mo. Cloth, $1.50, postpaid

ORDER OF THE

Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin Street, Boston, Mass.